

# THE SEWANEE REVIEW

---

VOL. XIV.]

JULY, 1906.

---

[No. 3.

## POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A UNIVERSITY STUDY

One of the ways in which the advance in human knowledge may be measured is in the number and character of the new sciences that are created and recognized as subjects worthy of treatment in higher institutions of learning as distinct educational disciplines. Thus the old *trivium* and *quadrivium* of mediæval days have given way to the elaborate curricula of modern universities and colleges. In general, this establishment of new departments of learning has taken the form not of the creation of wholly new sciences, but of the differentiation of older departments of inquiry into distinct lines of research and thought. A conspicuous instance of this process has been witnessed in this country during the past twenty years within the field of the so-called social sciences. The late Professor H. B. Adams has shown in his monograph "The Study of History in American Colleges and Universities," how recent has been the establishment in this country, even in our largest institutions, of independent chairs of history, the incumbents of which are required to be scholars specially trained for their work. Still more recent has been the recognition of Political Economy as a distinct educational discipline; while it is only within the last ten, or even five years, that Political Science has been marked off as a study which by its methods and subjects of inquiry requires for its successful study separation from the other social sciences, and especially from History and Economics with which it has been, and still is, in considerable measure, so closely allied. Within

these few years, however, this movement has been very marked, and the number of independent departments and professorships of Political Science in our colleges and universities is rapidly increasing. In 1884 the American Historical Association was founded and in 1885 the American Economic Association established, each of which national societies includes within its membership practically all of the American scholars within their respective fields of inquiry. Until 1903, Political Science was without a national association to represent its especial interests. In that year there was established the American Political Science Association, which had an immediate success and now has more than three hundred members, a very considerable portion of whom are actively engaged in teaching in our colleges and universities. The successful establishment of this Association is undoubtedly the most important event that has occurred in the history of the scientific study of matters political in this country. It indicates the definite recognition of the fact that Political Science, by its problems and by its methods, requires to be studied as a separate department of knowledge.

The aim of Political Science is, as its name indicates, the scientific study of matters political. A matter is political when it has reference to the State, — to its nature, its right to be, its forms of organization, its activities, its ends. The State is a group of individuals viewed in a particular aspect, that is, viewed as an organized unit subject to the authority of a supreme will which is the source of all law. The State as thus the possessor of a supreme will, is said to be a political or legal person. The organization through which it expresses and executes its will is termed its government. The commands which it either directly expresses or accepts as the expression of its will, are known as laws. These laws are in turn divisible into public and private, and these in turn into still more special classes. We thus see that, generally speaking, there are three great topics with which the political scientist has primarily to deal: State, Government, Law. In so far as law relates to the determination of the form of government that shall exist, and the statement of the powers and responsibilities of the agents that operate it, it is termed constitutional, and where it relates to the details of administration, ad-

ministrative law. Where it relates to the rights and duties of States *inter se*, it is known as international. These three kinds of law — constitutional, administrative, and international — are so directly concerned with the State and its interests, that they are generally recognized to be subjects that require academic treatment.

Private law, namely, that law which relates to the respective rights and duties which obtain between individuals, is usually handed over for study to purely professional schools whose aim it is to fit their students for the practice of the law. In truth, however, the private law, in order to be fully mastered, needs as scientific, as philosophical, a treatment as does any of the other branches of the law, or, indeed, as does any of the other social or exact sciences. This has long been recognized in Europe where law ranks as one of the four great faculties into which the universities are divided, — medicine, theology, and philosophy constituting the other three. And in this country, though the movement has as yet gained but little headway, the tendency is to approach the continental practice. At the universities of Yale, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, Cornell, and Columbia, academic students are permitted to take law courses which count toward the A.B. degree, and at the same time toward the LL.B. degree, if, after graduation, the law course is pursued. At the University of California and the Stanford University, these law courses may be elected by the student during the second, third, and fourth years, and, moreover, at these universities the schools of law appear as regular academic departments. For the present, however, and probably for some considerable time in the future, the teaching of private law in this country will in the main be given not in the departments of Political Science in our academic institutions, but either in wholly separate professional schools, or in departments of law in our colleges and universities which are sharply separated from the other academic departments of instruction.

Returning then to Political Science, we find that, excluding private law, we may group its inquiries under two main heads: First, the study of the State; second, the study of Government. The study of the State involves an examination of its nature and

of the principles which control its actions. Thus we have the three special subjects of (a) Political Theory or Philosophy, (b) Constitutional and Administrative Law, (c) International Law.

Constitutional and Administrative Law, as we have already seen, comprise those laws which control the action of the State in its relation to its own citizens, and towards others temporarily subject to its authority. International Law is the name given to those rules (whether or not they are *in sensu stricto* laws we need not now consider) which govern the relations of States *inter se*.

Political Theory or Political Philosophy is concerned with the essential nature of the State, the discovery of those characteristics by the presence of which its existence may be determined, and by the possession of which it may be distinguished from other forms of aggregate human life. The value of this purely abstract study, which unfortunately has been too much neglected in this country, it is difficult to over-estimate. Political theorizing until well into the Nineteenth Century was very largely of what the Germans term *naturrechtliche* character. Its aim was the establishment of certain principles founded on a doctrine of natural rights which, it was deemed by their authors, should govern the State in the exercise of its powers. As the determination of what these natural rights were lay almost wholly within the arbitrary opinion of each writer, the results not only differed widely from one another, but were ascertained, and their application demanded, with but little regard to special conditions of time and place. As long as political speculations maintained this subjective character, the results to which they led were of comparatively little scientific value, and it is not surprising that Burke should have described them as "the Great Serbonian bog 'twixt Damietta and Mt. Cassius old, where armies whole have sunk." But at the present day, political theory, though still, of course, abstract, as is all theory, is no longer subjective, or metaphysical. It has become analytical. It examines the different forms of political life which the world exhibits, or has exhibited, and from this examination conducted with logical accuracy and acuteness, it discovers those essential criteria which enable it to formulate valid definitions, and,



based upon those definitions, to establish exact classifications. It thus furnishes the propædæutic of a true political science. It supplies, in short, the true logic of constitutional and international law. It enables the constitutional jurist to develop the legitimate powers of his government in strict consonance with the premises and conclusions previously established; and makes it possible for the statesmen in charge of foreign affairs correctly to interpret the complex international world and thus to deduce the respective rights and obligations which flow from the many forms of political life and interstate federations and alliances which are presented to him. Upon this point the writer takes the liberty of quoting a paragraph from a paper published by him several years ago.<sup>1</sup> After calling attention to the complexity of modern international life with its federations, alliances, colonies, protectorates, spheres of interest, leases of territory, etc., the writer there said: "It is not difficult to see that, if these various conditions and problems are to receive satisfactory classification and interpretation, and if general principles are to be deduced in accordance with which future complications are to be judged, the essential foundations and characteristics of sovereignty must be examined. We must determine what powers and attributes are essential to the possession of sovereignty; whether its existence is an infallible and necessary test of statehood; to what extent the exercise of its powers may be delegated without parting with its possession; the distinction between governments *de facto* and governments *de jure*; whether States may be created by international compact; whether the origin of political authority in general is susceptible of a juristic interpretation; what is the essential character of positive law and whence its validity; and to what extent so-called international law is law at all. . . . All of these are problems for the solution of which recourse must be had to abstract political philosophy."

It is an interesting fact, especially to those of the South, that in this country, John C. Calhoun was the first to apply with accuracy and acumen this modern analytic method to the solution

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Value of Political Philosophy" in the *Political Science Quarterly* for March, 1900.

of the problems involved in our own federal system of government. The accuracy of his analysis and definition of sovereignty cannot be questioned, and the theoretical conclusions which he drew therefrom were obtained by flawless logic. Demonstrating that sovereignty by its very nature means absolute legal omnipotence, and that, as such, it is inalienable and indivisible, he showed that, granting the historical premise that the States were sovereign in 1789, they could not, by a compact between themselves, have transferred this sovereignty, either in whole or in part, to the general government. It is the irrefutable character of this reasoning that has forced most of those who have upheld the sovereignty of the United States since the establishment of the constitution to deny what most of them, previously to Calhoun's time, had admitted, that the States were severally sovereign during the period from 1776 to 1789. Calhoun, thus, whatever we may think of the practical policies which he advocated, deserves beyond question to rank as the founder of the modern school of political philosophers in this country.

Leaving now the discussion of the three fields of Political Philosophy, Constitutional and Administrative Law, and International Law, into which the general study of the State is divisible, we turn to a consideration of the topics embraced within the study of Government, the second of the two great subjects with which Political Science as a university study has to deal. Here the method of study is more descriptive than analytical, more directly practical than speculative. The work resolves itself into an examination of the various existing and historical types of political machinery through which the State operates or has operated,—of federal and unitary, centralized and decentralized, absolute and limited, direct and representative, national and colonial, parliamentary and presidential forms of government. These governments are studied not only to discover their morphology or structure, but to ascertain the ways in which they actually operate, the merits and defects which they exhibit, and the circumstances under which, respectively, they may be expected to produce good or bad results. Along with this study of government goes properly the study of political parties, the

forms of organization that they assume, and the forces that operate them. Descending from these general to more particular questions, each specific problem of administration furnishes a topic for special treatment. Thus there are the problems of colonial government and administration, of municipal government, of civil service, of primary elections, of proportional representation, of the referendum, of state or city ownership of public utilities, of the state regulation of the economic, social, and ethical interests of the citizen, and also the larger problems of national policies in the field of world politics. Political Science may never hope to produce an art of statesmanship which will furnish the citizen and the public official with the exact guidance that the chemist, the physicist, or the mathematician furnishes to those in the technological trades, but it may and does furnish information of extreme value — information absolutely indispensable to those who are called upon to play any part either in the formulation or execution of public policies, or in selecting those who do. Academic training cannot make unnecessary a practical experience in politics, but it can furnish the knowledge which renders one able correctly to learn the lesson of that experience and intelligently to apply that lesson when learned.

Properly pursued, Political Science requires the employment of both the historical and the comparative methods. Foreign systems of public jurisprudence and foreign governments and methods of administration require to be studied in order that there may thus be obtained the data upon which the analytical method may be employed, and in order that practical principles of statesmanship and public policy may be safely declared. From the centralized systems of Europe, the sources of administrative efficiency are discovered. From the working of the parliamentary system in England and on the Continent, the merits and defects of our own presidential system are made more evident. From the interpretations which written constitutions have received abroad, assistance is derived in the construction of our own instruments of government. In this connection, it is to be observed that our own country offers unexampled opportunities for the comparative study of political questions in that we have here of our own forty-six complete systems of government in practical

operation, one federal and forty-five state governments, not to speak of the territories and insular dependencies. It has been said, and with truth, that Aristotle was able to prepare his wonderful work on Politics because he had at hand several hundred distinct Hellenic constitutions and governments to study. In America we are almost as fortunate, having almost a surfeit of material awaiting scholarly, scientific treatment.

Though Political Science, both by the material with which it has to deal, and by the special problems which it has to solve, occupies a field definitely marked off from the other social sciences, and especially from History and Economics, it yet is a subject, the study of which must ever remain closely allied with them. Here again it is hoped that the writer will be pardoned if he reproduce words which he has employed upon a previous occasion.<sup>2</sup> "Of the relation between History and Political Science it has been said by the late Sir John Seeley that politics without history has no root, and that history without politics has no fruit. The connection between economics and politics is, if anything, more intimate. Without the information that the study of economic principles and of economic history affords, the political scientist is unable either to explain many of the processes of political growth or wisely to determine lines of public policy. Upon the other hand, deprived of the knowledge furnished by the scientific study of the mechanism and methods of operation of governments, the economist finds himself insufficiently informed either correctly to analyze past and existing economic conditions or satisfactorily to devise the means by which the truths that he discovers may be made of practical advantage to mankind. And yet, intimate as are these relationships, the field of political science is one that may be clearly distinguished from that of history as well as from that of economics, and the topics which the field includes, in order to be treated adequately, need to be studied as distinct subjects of inquiry. It is true that to a very considerable extent the phenomena dealt with by the historian, the economist, and the political scientist,

---

<sup>2</sup>"The American Political Science Association," in the *Political Science Quarterly* for March, 1904.

respectively are the same, but each examines his material from a different standpoint. The historian has for his especial aim the determination and portrayal of processes and stages of human development. With economic and political interests he is concerned only in so far as it is necessary for him to understand them in order to explain the movements he is studying. So also with the economist. His primary interest is in the ascertainment of the principles that control the production, exchange and consumption of wealth; and he finds it necessary to enter upon political ground only in so far as government has an influence upon economic conditions, either by reason of its cost, the economic security that it gives, or the manner in which it directly interferes, or properly may interfere, in the regulation of the industrial interests of the people. Thus, since neither the historian nor the economist is primarily interested in the study of matters political, it is necessary, in order that these matters may receive adequate scientific treatment, that they should be studied by those whose special interest in them is upon their political side."

This natural and necessary affiliation between history, economics, and politics is well represented in the institution to which the writer belongs. The requirements for obtaining the degree of doctor of philosophy at the Johns Hopkins University prescribe that the student shall take for special study one principal and two subordinate subjects. Almost invariably the student taking one of these three subjects as his principal subject selects the other two for subordinates. Thus, in fact, the three graduate departments, though administratively independent and each under the direction of a different professor, so far as their students are concerned, are almost united into one. In nearly all of the lecture courses and even in the seminaries, the students are intermixed. Furthermore, every fortnight, in what is known as the Historical and Political Science Association of the University, all of the instructors and students of these departments meet together for the reading and discussion of formal papers and for the presentation of reviews of current scientific historical, political, and economic literature.

In conclusion of this paper, it may properly be remarked that



the collegiate institutions of the South have failed to recognize to the extent that the institutions of other sections of the country have done, that the field of political inquiry is one which for its successful pursuit requires to be taught, not by the historian or the economist, but by one whose special training and primary interests are in the political field. Yet no part of our country at the present time stands in greater need of exact political thinking and wise political guidance. Industrially, socially, and intellectually, the South is undergoing a rapid development, and this means that her political thinking and her political institutions and laws must be adapted to the new conditions that are being brought into existence. Naturally the people of the South are of superior political ability, and that they will successfully solve the political problems with which they are, and in the future will be, confronted, there can be no doubt. Of this work the academies and colleges should perform their proper share.

W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

## AN ACADEMIC SERMON<sup>1</sup>

The prevalence of the notion among all sorts and conditions of men that they could have done better in another calling than in the humdrum one they have chosen has been often made the subject of ironical comment. Their attempts, periodic or spasmodic, to give concrete proofs of their versatility — that is, to furnish evidence that their notion is not ill-founded — have also afforded satirically inclined persons occasions for laughter. Sometimes, however, a thoughtful mind probes far below the surface and finds in the phenomenon material — if not for philosophy, at least for poetry. You will remember the exquisite use Browning made of Raphael's century of sonnets and of the angel Dante painted. I thought of Browning's poem the other day when I picked up a volume by the distinguished French critic, Jules Lemaître. It was entitled "*En Marge des Vieux Livres*," and, instead of being a collection of essays on literary masterpieces, it was a group of short stories or *contes* developed by the writer's imagination or fancy from a starting point found either in the Iliad or the Odyssey or the Gospels or the Golden Legend. Eleven years before, M. Lemaître had published a similar volume entitled, from the leading story, "Myrrha." Six years before that, as far back as 1888, my friend the English scholar, the late Dr. Richard Garnett, had also found here and there among the old and strange books he was guarding in the British Museum thoughts and fancies that had germinated into quaint stories, which he had collected under the title of "The Twilight of the Gods." The Frenchman's tales were the more graceful and charming; the Englishman's the more witty and bizarre. I am here concerned with their volumes, however, only as they illustrate in the field of literature the prevalence of the desire to succeed in some other than the chosen, the natural field for our talents, or at least, the field which the public in its rough and ready fashion has come to regard as proper to them.

---

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Men's English Graduate Club of Columbia University, March 16, 1906.

The tyranny of the public in making these rough and ready judgments has been the subject of frequent complaint. Lincoln's statesmanship, as we all know, was long discounted because of his reputation as a humorist. I bought a copy of the first edition of Dr. Garnett's tales from a Holborn bookseller at a shockingly low price, and, as I sat reading it till a late hour in my lodgings, I was impelled to meditate upon the irony of fate that plants nine out of ten of us on a little plot of calling or career and, with more authority than Canute's, exclaims, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther!" There is no use in kicking against the pricks, or in pursuing the subject — especially as I am only abusing the privilege of being allowed an introductory paragraph or two by approaching my real topic of discussion along as circuitous a route as I can contrive to take.

Well, why not? Am I not condemned to lecture, week in and week out, in as straightforward and formal a way as I can compass upon authors, authors, authors, until I am tempted to wish, either that the greatest Author of all had blotted out what we flatter ourselves to be his fairest work, or that there could be a real book-burning Omar, who would have the sense to preserve a few volumes of great poetry. Let me then continue to meander long enough to remark that in all the illustrations I have given of attempted incursions into other than the chosen fields of activity a certain artistic fitness of choice may be discovered. No vulgar striving, no sordid discontent, no flagrant metamorphosis is here such as may be seen in the proverbial sunday-school superintendent who becomes an absconding cashier, or the exemplary bourgeois who endeavors to make a place for himself as a leader of society. Proseman wishes to show that he too can write verse, painter that he can sing and poet that he can paint, critic that he can tell stories and novelist that he can criticise — these are the innocent aspirations and delusions we are considering. Dante, painting his angel, anticipated Dryden in thinking — naturally, he could not quote him:

For Painture near adjoining lay,  
A plenteous province, and alluring prey.

And Browning was charitable or enthusiastic enough to write some six centuries later:

You and I would rather see that angel,  
Painted by the tenderness of Dante,  
Would we not? than read a fresh *Inferno*.

Easy rhetorical question for the poet to ask — neither picture nor fresh “*Inferno*” being among such possibilities even as the

One precious, tender-hearted scroll  
Of pure Simonides,

of which Wordsworth dreamed and sang. It is well enough when your attempts in an untried field are lost or safely locked up in your drawer — I refer specifically to the love poems you have all written when you should have been grinding away at your dissertations; — it is another matter when your precious bantling appears between boards or is hung in an exhibition room. Then you wonder at your temerity and begin to think that the cynical old world is right when it avers that a shoemaker should stick to his last — *ne sutor supra crepidam*.

It is time, however, for me to make the reason for my circumambulations unequivocally plain. I am merely, not so much whistling for want of thought, as talking to get my courage up. I want to desert the chair for the desk or the pulpit — only for a few moments, it is true, but my hesitation is none the less genuine. Preaching in season is something we are at least inured to; preaching out of season is what we all resent, clerics perhaps most of men. Even a President of the United States sermonizes at his peril, much more a poor professor. But a sermon, after the “firstly” has rung its knell, is less formidable than a sermon that has proceeded for some minutes without a text to stand on, yet with infinite possibilities of dragging its slow length along.

You will find my text in Cowper’s “Task” (I. 749), which runs:

God made the country and man made the town.

This text I wish to apply to an educational problem quite different from any that Cowper discussed in his “*Tirocinium*.” We have heard much of late about the prospective disappearance of

the small college, which in its ideal state is essentially a rural or a village institution. I am not such a partisan of the small college as to affirm that God made it and man the great urban university, nor do I intend to discuss upon normal lines the question of its prolonged existence and usefulness. While I believe that the high-school is bound for more and more of our young men and women to fill the function performed by the gymnasium of the Germans and furnish all the preliminary training that is needed for university studies in the arts, the sciences, and the professions, and while I believe further that in many colleges the shortening of the course that is now permitted to exceptional students, and the blending of professional and strictly academic studies in the curriculum that leads to a bachelor's degree, will produce a radical change in the work of culture for which such colleges stand, I see no reason why this vast country, with its many social strata, its inequalities of wealth, its variety of inhabiting stocks, its chaos of ideals—none the less real for the true unity of sentiments and aspirations that underlies the indefinite something we denominate Americanism—should not find ample use for all the small colleges now in existence and for more than are likely to be founded in the near future. In other words, I suspect that the so-called problem of the small college and the university is not so much a phase of the universal problem involved in the catch expression, "the survival of the fittest," as it is a phase of the equally universal problem set before all persons and institutions that have an ideal to live up to. It would be nearer the mark, perhaps, to say that these two problems have their bases in the fact that one and the same truth is looked at from opposite sides. Persons and institutions that live up to their ideals are, in the large, the fittest to survive, and do survive. And in very real ways the college and the university help one another to survive. We are probably inclined to over-emphasize one of these ways—the passing of students from the college to the university. That is important, but, as I have said, the chances seem to be that the college-trained university student will occupy in time to come a less and less important position as compared with the school-trained student. We may flatter ourselves that he will always occupy a more aristocratic



position because he will come to the university bearing the stamp of an institution possessing traditions and an *esprit de corps* that no public high-school is likely to develop. But aristocratic positions may be a positive disadvantage in a vast commercial democracy or a huge socialistic state, and what sort of political entity America will be in a hundred years no man living is wise enough to know. It seems wiser — at least for tonight — to look at another beneficial relation that obtains between the university and the college — the relation involved in the fact that more and more the college faculties are being manned by specially trained university students.

Here again, of course, we find ourselves confronted with the phenomena of a process of evolution. The old college professor, who was only too likely to be a broken down or unsuccessful clergyman but was also in many cases a man of genial culture, is rapidly being displaced by scholars of more special equipment, though often with less experience of life and less adaptability to their responsible positions. Even if the college should play a less important part in the future than it has played in the past, the opportunity of the college professor to make for the spread of true culture must continue to be great, and it is a matter of considerable moment to the country if the college faculties are today being recruited from men whose training has been necessarily passing from the broad to the narrow rather than from the narrow to the broad. Fortunately, however, life is like a battle — it is very seldom fought out on precisely the plans previously formed or without calling for many a departure from the lines of method in which its participants have been trained. In teaching, as in everything else, the spirit counts for more than the letter, and it is upon the spirit in which you young scholars should leave the university, as most of you must do in the nature of things, and take up your work in the colleges that I wish to dwell for the remainder of this sermon. I shall speak mainly to those whose lot is likely to be cast in the rural or village college or the large private boarding school rather than to those who are likely to enter city colleges or high-schools; because at present the former class, if not still the more numerous, has at least more of a tradition to keep up, and because remarks that

fit the one class will be applicable with but slight modification to the other.

Leaving a great university involves giving up many advantages, among which may be enumerated the opportunity to frequent large libraries, laboratories, museums, theaters, and similar public institutions, the general stimulating energy and movement of city life, and last but not least, the special inspiration imparted by contact with a vast body of workers in one's own sphere of activity. I have known few students who did not want to stay in the metropolis. I have never failed to recommend their going to a small college or a good school as preferable to their taking a minor position in a university. I recognize that the university position affords certain marked facilities for the training of scholars, and occasionally furnishes an opportunity for distinguished and speedy academic advancement; but I think that the teacher and the man are more important than the scholar, and I doubt whether the university is so good an agent for the making of teachers and men (after they have ceased to be students) as the college or the school. The university, in my judgment, tends to overpower, to dwarf the individual, to normalize him, to urbanize him. His manners and clothes gain greatly through this process; I doubt if his mind and character gain in like measure. In our profession, as in that of literature, it is a good thing to grow up in the provinces and sometimes to live there always, with only an occasional visit to the urban centres. True, the provinces are narrowing; they produce a plentiful crop of commonplace and eccentric people. But they afford more leisure, more retirement, more opportunity for individual thought upon life and its problems; they make more requisition on our social capacities; they put less premium on specialization. All things considered, my judgment is that the country is a better nurse of strong character than the city, the college than the university. I suppose many would deny this; but, the longer I live, the less I am impressed with the essential independence of the mind and character moulded by large cities and large institutions. It is independence, thoughtfulness, creative energy, and versatility that one should mainly want to see every student display. Accuracy of scholarship and neatness of

method, and general urbanity rank below those qualities, and I think there is more chance of the greater qualities being developed by the man or woman that leaves the university than by the man or woman that stays.

This belief of mine, which I hold in spite of numerous experiences tending to disprove it, has been strengthened by some recent utterances of men in comparatively high positions — utterances which would scarcely have been made by men much in the habit of doing that unfashionable something known as meditating. Action, as you are well aware, is the watchword of this transcendent generation. One almost trembles when one dares to suggest that thinking has a modest part to play in life, public or private — especially when one reads in the newspapers letters proposing that laws be passed to punish all who dare to criticise men in high stations. Some day a sapient person will perceive that the best way to put an end to unpleasant criticism is to pass a law against thinking. If you think nothing, good or bad, you are sure to acquiesce in the wisdom of all the powers that be — political, ecclesiastical, academic. And the powers that be, with their natural bent for observing the laws, will be equally innocent of thought, and will have all their time for action. Then surely, in our expressive parlance, we shall “make things hum.”

But a truce to such treasonable remarks. Everyone knows that in this fortunate country no important action takes place that is not dictated by the *vox populi*, which is only another name for the voice or the wisdom of God, even when it appears to be megaphoned, to apply the words of Milton, through the seven-fold possession of a desperate stupidity. All that I wish to remark is that I think the *vox hominis* is a little more respectable than the *vox populi*, and that if you will use well the opportunities for study and reflection afforded you in a small college, you will have a very good chance, when you do talk, to talk with the voice of a man.

Now for a few words as to the drawbacks of the small college position and the way to face them so as to keep them from neutralizing its advantages.

I suppose that we will all place first the wearing number of hours of instruction and the wide range of subjects. This is an

evil inseparable from small endowments, but one that is being diminished in the older and wealthier colleges. Like all other inevitable evils it should be borne with as much cheerful patience as possible. Observe, however, that it generally comes when one is young and strong, that it tests one's endurance, makes one combat one's laziness, develops one's versatility, one's resources, one's powers of self-preservation. I am a living proof that it is entirely possible to teach eighteen hours a week in a bewildering range of subjects—I blush to say that at a pinch I have been known to teach French and German, mathematics and the history of the English law of real property—I repeat that it is possible to teach a multitude of subjects and not completely lose one's health or one's self-respect. It is even possible at the same time to do some writing and editing. The way to do it is not difficult. Avoid thinking or talking much about what you have to undertake, but when you see that a thing needs doing and that people look to you to do it, go ahead and trust in Providence to bring you out with something accomplished. Dunning, the great lawyer, a member of Johnson's club, said that a third of his immense business was done by himself, a third got itself done, and a third never got done at all. I suspect that he was a very wise man. All hard workers, as a matter of course, will grow weary and brood and play the martyr; but if they manage to be in the main good-natured and energetic, they will be able someday to look back on a good deal of fair accomplishment, and although they will be ready to admit that they made mistakes every day and wrote and said and did things of which they were later ashamed, they would have been much more ashamed if they had not displayed "the courage of imperfection," and done their best under trying circumstances.

Now you see there is very little about the over-work of a college instructor that is new to me, and I can tell you honestly that I do not regret my trials. I learned much about human nature that I could never have got in any other way, I learned to work, to save time, to carry several things together; but the best of it all was that there was little danger after that training that I should lie awake at night wondering whether I had offended this or that student in my last class, or let a typograph-

ical error slip by in my last article. It seems to me that a small college is a very good place to get a fairly sensible philosophy of working and living. So make up your minds that there is a real jewel in this particular toad's head of adversity, and remember that the only true recipe to follow under the circumstances is — think as little of yourself as you conveniently can and as much as you can of the needs of the institution and your students. You are sure to get on then and, as the years go by, the chances grow less and less that the excessive dissipation of energy in a large variety of interests, from which I undoubtedly suffered, will be required in an American college. I may add that, of course, a certain amount of method in one's use of time is necessary, but that there is no laying down rules. Some people work by bits, some by great stretches. Some take their rest and amusement by rule and measure; others follow up a spell of labor by a spell of incubating. All that you must work out for yourselves. Only remember that perhaps the main secret of efficient work under pressure lies in a borrowed phrase I have already used "the courage of imperfection;" and that that involves a lack of self-conceit. The man who refrains from doing a thing because probably he will not do it to his own liking is not in my opinion often actuated by the artist's desire of perfection, but is actuated by the fear of censure that so dominates the self-conscious and the conceited man.

Next to overwork I suppose we must place the lack of the appliances of culture — especially of books in sufficient quantity. Here again I have had plenty of experience, but I have always managed to surmount my difficulties. I was careful in buying for myself — getting fundamental books and seeing that they covered certain topics fairly well. I went as far as I could go in any line of research, and then waited patiently to get to a library or else got friends in other places to lend me books. Fortunately there has been a great extension of the facilities for obtaining such loans since my early days. I made up my mind that doing my teaching as well as I could and not doing work involving research was the business of nine months out of my year. And, finally, I could always afford to have books to read. What is lacking in such situations as mine was and yours may be, is books to refer



to. No man in these days of cheap books has occasion to complain that he cannot get enough to read. And here is a beautiful compensation. The scholar, strictly speaking, is often very ill-read. You as teacher rather than scholar can read widely if you will, and your work as teacher and your character as man will improve with judicious and wide reading and, in important respects, you will often be better off than many a university instructor. You will have fewer distractions too — such as the theatre — and, books being a little more seriously taken in the provinces, you will be less exposed to the danger of becoming a dilettante or an amateur. I have noticed among men in large universities a tendency to amateurish reading or else to grinding, mechanical scholarship. Wide, sane reading makes the fuller man, and you can do such reading even in the smallest college. You may publish fewer monographs and special articles, but when you do get a chance to do a piece of research, it will have qualities all the larger if you have read widely. And by all means labor to make your college library better; for thinking of those who are to come after you will keep you from brooding too much over your own lack of appliances. I may add that the small college library often brings one into more intimate contact with books than is possible in a large library. One is not swamped by them — one can easily get the run of the library in several departments. One can handle more books and much may be picked up in that way. Finally, in this matter of reading, let me emphasize two points. Read all the time you are not teaching, playing, eating, and sleeping. I mean this almost literally, if you can stand it. Tuck in your five minutes here and your ten minutes there, unless you are sure you can employ them better in thought, as you often can. In the next place do not be discouraged at what you forget and do not fail every now and then to calculate how small a number of books you could read if you read ten hours a day for sixty years — small I mean as compared with the number a wide-awake reader would like to read. And keep up all the languages you have and live in hopes of adding to them — even if you have to admit that you will probably be eighty like Cato before you begin Greek.

A third drawback to work in a small college is what I may call

in general the cramping environment. Though I have already said that I regard the city as perhaps more cramping so far as concerns originality of thought, it would be folly not to admit that the country and the small town have their own ways of cramping. There is considerable temptation to become lazy and humdrum, and many college professors yield to it. The chief correctives are love of work, living to a certain extent your own intellectual life, keeping up with literature, seizing legitimate opportunities to travel. There is a superfluity of gossip in a small place, and that means that sooner or later you will wonder at the meanness of men. You will keep on wondering both at their meanness and at their foolishness, but trying not to be mean one's self will always take one's mind off the injury another's meanness has done one. It is pleasanter and safer to think of the many kind deeds of which one has been the beneficiary and, take it by and large, I suspect that there is as much mean intriguing and quarreling in big as in little places. Hearts are made to ache everywhere, and, although a mean man is perhaps less easily avoided in a small faculty than in a large, still I think that if you attend to your business, you will have little to complain of. And one great advantage you will have. Men and women may be mean and stupid, but boys and girls are generally the reverse of mean, and the fresh qualities of youth make up in a measure for their stupidity. You can more than make up for the cramping gossip of the small place by having more intimate contact with your students than is usually possible in a large university. No matter where you go — North, East, South, or West — you have a splendid opportunity here. You may never do much to extend the bounds of knowledge, but how much you can do to extend the bounds of character — to make the new generation advance upon the old! This is the noblest thing connected with learning — this handing on the torch. I need not dwell on it, but I must say that next to the family relations those established between teacher and student seem to me the loveliest and truest. What are a host of books and articles one has written, if one has taught all one's life without having made a host of real friends? I think that there is no reason why you should not make friends by your teaching and also friends by your books; but by all

means make friends somehow. Only let me remind you that the friends made by any derogation from your office are not worth having. I have watched this carefully, and I have never seen the rule fail. Any carelessness with students as to the college regulations with regard to cards, drinking, or what not — any questionable conversation — and you forfeit some of their respect. They want us to respect ourselves and our office. They do not want us to talk about athletics and betray our real ignorance of the subject. They may laugh at a questionable joke, but they will take it out on us in private. They want us to be true to them, and we cannot be that unless we are first true to ourselves.

I am aware that this is very didactic, but that is what I started out to be. And, to continue, you will avoid the mistake of trying to conceal your ignorance — who can? — and that rarer, almost worse, mistake, if you are dealing with older students, of trying to reserve some of your knowledge in order to publish it or exploit it in some way for your own behoof. The only thing a true teacher has a right to deny to any of his pupils is an exhibition of the bad side of his own character. I do not mean by this that he should be at all hypocritical. I mean only that we all have faults and angularities, and that we ought to try to keep these from offending our students in any way. To our knowledge, our zeal, our time they have full claims — and above all to our sympathy. And here let me call your attention to one special danger which I have observed in more than one place at close range. If you find that you have a strong influence on any student or set of students, it may become your duty to check that influence at a certain point, even if you have to suffer a wrench in doing it. The relation of master and disciple is a beautiful one, if the master continues always to respect the disciple's individuality, and the disciple respects himself. But, when the teacher makes himself the center of a circle of flattering student admirers, when he seeks to impress his ideas of literature and life upon them instead of trying to develop them into independent seekers after truth, he loses sight, I think, of the true meaning of education, which is a drawing forth of the character implicit in every child and youth, not a grafting or substi-

tution of another character. I frankly say that I think the presence in any college or university of a strong personality that in whole or in part spends its strength in producing immature copies of itself is a source of danger. A true stimulator, a true maker of men is a blessing; but I do not believe in the teacher who

Like Cato gives his little Senate laws  
And sits attentive to his own applause.

From Plato to Pater this sort of teacher has been known in the world, and while he has often created beautiful things in literature, he has generally managed to raise ugly, if unjust, suspicions about his own manliness, and that of his intimate disciples. There is such a thing as over-intimacy between teacher and pupil. There is such a thing as settling down on a youth's individuality and vampire-like sucking all the life out of it. Any really high-minded man would scorn to be surrounded by flatterers, and would shun the temptation to try to make out of his pupils anything but strong, independent men and women. Is not the respect and love of a few such worth all the adulation, all the trumpeting, and all the advertising in the world? And is it not a sign of doubt as to our own strength and largeness if we cannot devote ourselves to training up men and women to surpass us in our own lines if they can? Any teacher who is capable of being jealous of his pupils, who is afraid to see them grow up to their full stature or to have them come under the influence of other men is truly pitiable. But there are such teachers, and my warning is not useless.

I might go on giving you advice forever, and flattering myself that I was merely indulging in the privilege of lengthened utterance claimed by the preachers of old, but you would soon give me ocular demonstration that times have changed. So I will add but one bit of counsel. It seems to me to be a very good thing to have some piece of writing going on even if one can find but an hour a week to put on it. Write an address for a literary society or club, accept invitations to speak throughout the State, write an occasional review — in other words, do not neglect creative and more or less formal work, for the time may come when you will have to do or will want to do not a little of it.

And have at least one line of reading on which you do practically no writing or talking. It supplees the mind and furnishes the needed element of disinterested culture. Always to read pencil in hand and card-catalogue in reach is deadening. Always to talk and never to write promotes garrulity, and not a little slipshodness. And now, checking my own garrulity, I will end as I began by assuring you that life outside a great centre has its special advantages and that its peculiar disadvantages can undoubtedly be neutralized in part. There is a fine field of work before you in the colleges and schools, and, when you return, in whatever capacity, to your university *alma mater*, you will find your old teachers, with their beards growing grayer each year, delighted to hear of your success.

W. P. TRENT.

Columbia University, New York.



## THE LAW OF MOSES HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED

I suppose there is no part of the Old Testament which presents more difficulties to the average reader than what is popularly known as "The Law of Moses." In four books — Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy — are voluminous statements of laws and ritual regulations which often are so intimately connected with each other that the mind gets hopelessly bewildered in trying to form any clear and definite conception as to what the Law of Moses really is. Thus we have stated in the Authorized Version, without any effort made to separate them from the historical narrative, the laws relating to the Ritual of Oblations, the Consecration of Priests, the methods of Purification and Atonement, the regulations which must be observed in the case of Vows and Tithes, the thousand and one specifications of the Tabernacle and its Services, until our brains get so completely muddled that after we have read religiously through these particular parts of Holy Writ, the only thing we remember is that the Jewish Church — and what is practically the same thing, the Jewish People — had a most elaborate and minute system of ecclesiastical and civil law. And as though the matter was not sufficiently complicated, we are told by scholars "that the laws contained in the Pentateuch do not form a homogeneous body proceeding at one time from one and the same legislative mind, that of Moses, but really consist of successive strata of legal enactments, representing widely separated periods of time, having much in common but also not a little in which they do not agree, so that they cannot be united into one harmonious whole."

If we accept this dictum of the modern scientific school — and I see no reason why we should not — then we shall discover that the Hebrew Law which we find in the Old Testament consists of four successive strata of legal enactments. Thus the oldest form goes back to the days of Moses and is known as "The Law of the Ten Words," or the Decalogue; the second is "The Book of the Covenant," which consists of those legal enactments to be found in the Book of Exodus from the twentieth chapter,

twenty-third verse, to chapter twenty-four; the third, "The Deuteronomic Code," found in the Book of Deuteronomy, beginning with the twelfth chapter and extending to the twenty-seventh; and lastly, "The Levitical Code," to be discovered in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Now while these various codes have much in common they differ in important details. This shows us that the Higher Criticism is unquestionably right in its affirmation that Hebrew Law — like the case of common law everywhere — went through a development, an evolution, from a simple to a complex form, from the plain and majestic declaration of the Moral Law by Moses, down to the subtle, minute, elaborate definitions of ecclesiastical jurisprudence by Ezra and the Scribes. This much I think will be admitted by all who study the subject in the spirit of free inquiry and unbiased by theological prejudice.

My purpose, in this brief paper, will be first of all to take each of these great divisions and show what they have peculiar to themselves and how they differ from each other. In this way we shall get a bird's eye view of the subject, and besides, I trust, it will make us realize that we owe a profound debt of gratitude to those careful and laborious students who have given up their lives to the interpreting of the Old Testament in the light of scientific inquiry and research.

(I) The first division of our subject goes back to the Ten Words — the Decalogue — enunciated by Moses at the command of God, from the mist-wrapped mountain of Sinai. This is the oldest of all the codes and must have been in existence before the year 1000 B. C.

It will not be necessary to rehearse the Ten Commandments as we may hear them read every Sunday in the Communion Office, but two things may be observed: First, the Law is severely plain. There is no ritual. The fundamentals of religion and morality are the only things commanded and enforced. Secondly, there is as yet no separation of the people from any priestly class in the community. Just before the Ten Words were given we read:

And the Lord called unto Moses out of the mountain, saying: Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: Ye have seen

what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation.

How different all this is from subsequent codes will be easily seen as we proceed with our examination.

(II) The Book of the Covenant is the second great division of our subject and we note that it simply re-states the noble truth taught by Moses that there is but one God. This, moreover, is the foundation-stone upon which all after legislation is built up. One of the peculiarities of this code which separates it from all the others is the Law relating to altars:

An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee.

In later years we shall see this particular legislation completely changed by subsequent enactments.

The beginning of all civil jurisprudence — the *Lex Talionis* — is clearly defined:

He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death. . . . Thou shalt give life for life, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

We note also the terrible decree which served the infernal Salem Witch-Hunters their moral justification:

Thou shalt not suffer a sorceress to live.

From this grim, old law, however, here and there gleams forth a kindly reference to the poor and oppressed:

Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. . . . If thou at all take thy neighbor's garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it unto him by that the sun goeth down; for that is his only covering, it is his garment for his skin, wherein shall he sleep? . . . If thou lend money to any of my people with thee that is poor, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor; neither shalt ye lay upon him usury. . . . If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again.

In this last quotation we have undoubtedly an adumbration of that divine Spirit which afterwards found its complete fulfillment in the words of Christ:

Love your enemies.

To sum up the character, then, of this brief code, we find that "it is suited to the needs of a society in a very early stage of civilization. If, as may well be allowed, the main substance of its laws has descended from the Mosaic legislation, there is no reason to doubt that it has also, at different times, been adapted, by subsequent revision, to the requirements of the people when they were in the enjoyment of a settled agricultural life."

(III) Passing now to the third division — The Deuteronomic Code — put forth centuries later by Josiah and the reformers of his day, we notice that the little Book of the Covenant has grown into a formal and elaborate code of laws and regulations. The first point of difference from the earlier codes is that relating to the sanctuary. The first two had insisted only on the great fact that God is One; now Josiah and the men associated with him in their efforts to purify the church, insist upon one sanctuary.

As we know from early Jewish history, it was customary to offer up sacrifices on any high hill. Priest, prophet and king built altars pretty much where they pleased. They would have resented strenuously any command to worship in one particular place to the exclusion of all others. This state of affairs had gone on for hundreds of years with the result that wholesale corruption had poured in upon the Jewish people through their intermingling with the heathen nations especially at the time of sacrifice. These hill altars scattered throughout the country were perfectly legitimate in the early days; but now they had to go if Israel as a nation and as a Church ever hoped to keep herself pure and undefiled. Therefore we read:

Ye shall surely destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills and under every green tree. . . . But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come: and thither ye shall bring

your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes. . . . Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest: but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offering.

We need hardly add that this law introduced a new and radical change into Hebrew life. We have but to think — as Professor Batten in his “*Old Testament from the Modern Point of View*” has pointed out — of Gideon, Samuel, David, Solomon, and hosts of others, in fact “the godliest souls that existed between Moses and Josiah,” who offered up sacrifices on any high hill that suited their convenience, to see how wide the line of demarcation is between the Law of the Book of the Covenant and the Law as given to us by the Puritans of Josiah’s day.

The Deuteronomic Code in the main is simply a development of the Book of the Covenant. The Book of Deuteronomy was one of the Books most quoted by our Lord. Again and again do we find anticipations of His teachings in its pages. The great law of charity could hardly be more exquisitely stated than in the following words:

Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian, because thou wast a stranger in his land. . . . Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates; in his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it. . . . Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take the widow’s raiment to pledge: but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence. . . . When thou reapest thine harvest in thy field and hast forgotten a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it. . . . When thou beatest thine olive tree, thou shalt not go over the boughs again. . . . When thou gatherest the grapes of thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean it after thee; it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless and for the widow.

And even the poor patient beast of burden is not forgotten:

Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.

(IV) We come now to the fourth and last division of our subject: “The Levitical Code.” The date of this last elaboration of Hebrew Law, in the opinion of a growing number of scholars, goes back to the time of Ezra and the return from the Babylon-



ian Captivity, that is to say, it is Post-Exilic. The Jewish Nation — as a nation — disappeared forever when the Jews were carried captive to Babylon. When they emerged from the thick darkness of their captivity they were a dependent people and the only thing left to them was their religion to which they clung with a devotion and passion that has truly something pathetic about it. It was all that was left out of the wreck and so they carefully, lovingly and laboriously elaborated everything that related to that religion's public observance.

Thus the last of the codes in the Bible has an extraordinary amount of space given to regulations connected with the Temple and its Service. We find described at great length the Law and Ritual of Oblations, the Law of Purification and Atonement, with all its minute references to what animals and insects are clean and what are unclean, what should be done in the case of leprosy and in the case of accidental defilement; the Ritual of Priestly Service; the various Laws of Offerings, the Regulations respecting Fringes; the Law of the Inheritance of Daughters; the merciless Law of Spoils; the Law of the Marriage of Heiresses; and the formal allotment of cities for the Levites and the Cities of Refuge for those who accidentally had slain their companions. In fact, as Professor Batten remarks, this last code is "the Priest's law book containing regulations by which the Priests ruled the community."

We are truly amazed at this tremendous growth from the Decalogue. With Ezra and the Scribes we enter a totally different atmosphere from the one surrounding Moses on the crags of Sinai. Ritualism was growing like a green bay tree when this last code was incorporated into the Old Testament.

This development of Hebrew Law from the simplicity of the Decalogue to the elaboration of the Levitical Code is not something inexplicable; but is wholly in accord with everyday experience. As we study the history of the Jews the effect of their successive environments will show itself in their literature and in their constitution as surely as the flower of the field is affected by the soil and the rain which cherish it. It is perfectly natural therefore and in accord with what we know of all life that when the Jewish Nation disappeared from off the face of the

earth, the Jewish People should turn to the one thing left them, namely their religion and its ritual. These were peculiarly and especially their own. Thus Ezra and his companions were the beginners of that great movement known as Rabbinism, which though it had many noble characteristics, degenerated at last into those inflexible parties, which centuries later crucified the Lord of Life, because He differed from them and would not square His conduct according to their preconceived judgments and opinions.

As we proceed to examine this last code we notice that Ezra and the Scribes go one step further respecting the ritual of the Temple. Moses, in majestic simplicity, said "One God!" Josiah and the noble men associated with him in his efforts to reform, declared: "One Sanctuary!" Now, Ezra and the Scribes affirm: "One Undeviating Ritual to be observed and practised in *one* Particular Sanctuary."

There are other minor differences which the late Professor Bruce in his valuable essay on "The Law of Moses" points out — an essay to which this part of my paper is deeply indebted — the most important being the separation of the Levites and the Priests. In the Deuteronomic Code they are one; in the Levitical Code they are distinct. "In Deuteronomy they are a poor class, and as such are recommended to the consideration of the charitable. In the Levitical Code there is an elaborate system of tithes, which, if worked out, would make the once poor class a rich and influential corporation."

Law, generally speaking, to the average man is dull reading and we need not be afraid to admit that this universal rule holds good with regard to the Law of Moses. And yet if we do read Hebrew Law — especially in the Book of Deuteronomy — we shall not wonder why our Lord so often quoted from this last Book or why He so frequently used it to enforce His teaching of the need of Charity which after all is the Law of God and of His Christ.

GEORGE DOWNING SPARKS.

Babylon, Long Island.

## THE WANE OF COURIER

It seems hard that the name and work of the wittiest of all Frenchmen should vanish from the face of the earth, but the character and amount of attention that successive generations have bestowed upon Paul-Louis Courier de Méré would seem to prophesy such a fate. Armand Carrel's biography, dated December 1829, calls him the most original of writers, asserts that in the *Pamphlet des Pamphlets* he offered the world the most perfect work of literary art which the language can boast, and protests with an earnestness that implies neglect at that early date: *Non, Courier n'est point oublié, et ne le sera point.* Some years later Traill, in England, is enthusiastic as to manner; but questions the permanent value of his work. In 1892, Francisque Sarcey denies him the credit of a single positive conviction; and the editorial note to the neat little Flammarion edition to which Sarcey's appreciation forms the preface, insists with a painful conscientiousness, reminding one of the pious apple-woman who informed prospective customers that her apples were rotten at the heart, that "Courier is not a great writer." In ten years his name has scarcely been mentioned in literature.

There are evident reasons, but they seem scarcely sufficient to account entirely for his disappearance. There are of course the very obvious ones that he attempted no monumental work, but scribbled a few lines here and a few lines there, and that he dealt almost entirely with ephemeral subjects; but "The Spectator," the *Provinciales*, the *Lettres Persanes* are disconnected fragments, and the underlying principles involved in Courier's discussions, in the purchase of Chambord and the prohibition of dancing at Luynes, are nearly the same for all ages and all peoples; if the dicta of Mirabeau and Jefferson are to be accepted absolutely, they are quite the same. Courier was a great rascal from his own confession, it is true; but so was Villon, and so was Byron. He was a man of profound learning, and as he himself suggests, *La science et l'éloquence sont peut-être incompatibles*; but he proved that the rule, if it be a rule, has exceptions, by writing appeals to the peasants that the peasants read and understood

and appreciated as keenly if not as intelligently as the learned among his readers.

A sounder reason for his failure to leave a permanent impress, is perhaps found in Sarcey's statement that he lacked positive convictions. He was always the sophist, often the impudent liar; he was always the writer, never the thinker. His most insistent objections to the purchase of Chambord for the little Duke of Bordeaux was that the establishment of the court in the neighborhood of his idyllic village of Luynes would, forsooth, furnish a bad example to the moral fashion-plates who inhabited it! Why it was advisable that the inhabitants of Chambord and environs should be shielded from the noxious influence of the court, rather than the peasants of another quarter, he neglects to state. Consider, in the light of such virtuous assumptions as the above, a statement like this: "Smuggling is not to be blamed. . . . The government cheats, and the man who can cheat the government is respected by everyone." Thus much for morality. And for literary discrimination: "The wretchedest little scribbler of the seventeenth century wrote better French than all the Jean-Jacques of ours." In one of his letters he writes half-seriously of Plutarch: "He'd make Pompey win the battle of Pharsalia if that would round off his phrase a little better." This startling statement is certainly more nearly true of the author than of Plutarch; and in the very making of it, in the very promulgation of such an unwarranted slander against the poor old pedagogue of Chæronea, Courier is exemplifying his own fatal tendency to sacrifice principle, not for pence, but for paradox.

And then what a mean, snivelling puppy he degenerates into on occasion! On the death of his father-in-law, the celebrated Hellenist, Clavier, Courier was a candidate for the place thus left vacant in the Academy of Inscriptions, but was unanimously rejected. The misused great man gave vent to his feelings in a letter the tenor of which may be gathered from the following dignified extract: ". . . I see accomplished this prophecy of my father: 'You will never be anything.' Until the present moment I suspected (as there is always something obscure in oracles), I thought he meant, 'you will never *do* anything,'—

which pleased me well enough, and even seemed to me a good omen for my rise in the world, for by doing nothing I could attain to everything, at least to becoming a member of the Academy. . . . but I was mistaken. The old gentleman had said, and he wasn't often wrong, 'you will never *be* anything,'—that is, you can never become a policeman, an exciseman, a spy, a duke, a lackey, or even a member of the Academy. . . . It is folly to struggle against destiny. . . ." and so on, *ad nauseam*, concluding with the statement that he had never wanted the place and that he never should try for it again. Whatever may have been the motives of the worthy gentlemen of the Academy in excluding the pamphleteer from their ranks, this puerile letter furnished them ample *ex post facto* justification. It is a question whether a man is capable of great things who is not great of mind.

Courier is passing, but how we dislike seeing him go! Did ever a Le Sage or a Stevenson contrive anything more deliciously irresponsible than that wild life of his? His ability to get himself into strange situations seems to have been inherited from his father, a spirited gentleman, Courier de Méré (Paul-Louis, by his own wish, was neither gentleman nor de Méré), who gallantly revenged himself on a nobleman that refused to pay what he owed, by alienating the affections of the nobleman's wife, and who was cudgelled and chased out of Paris in consequence; much as was the great Voltaire for similarly refusing to cringe to the aristocracy. To this circumstance the younger Courier owed his country training, and the clay stuck to his shoes all the rest of his life; for it must be confessed that in spite of his learning, in spite of his wonderfully delicate literary instinct, in spite of his gallantry and his gallantries, Paul-Louis was and remained a great boor.

He joined the army under much the same conditions as a dozen raw youths, apparently his inferiors in every essential respect, who became stars of the first magnitude in the Revolutionary firmament, while he remained, to his astonishment and eloquent indignation, a simple artillery captain. When we come to examine his military record, however, we find it hard to share his surprise. He was brave to a degree, as was proved by the



unconcerned fashion in which he sauntered over Italy as an amateur of the arts, while his countrymen were being stilettoed and *brûlés le plus doucement possible* all about him, — by his allowing himself to be left behind when the French evacuated Rome, because he hadn't quite finished his study of a manuscript in the Vatican Library, although he knew there wasn't one chance in a hundred of his escaping the fatal fury of the maddened populace. But was this supercilious indifference akin to the fierce devotion that made generals of Hoche and Moreau? His heart — if he had a heart — wasn't in the work. He was perfectly willing to lose a campaign, if he might thereby gain a lady's smiles; for this strange compound of peasant and savant, ugly and ungainly as Punch at the fair, seems to have been as irresistible with the ladies as his father before him. He was ready to desert on the eve of a battle if something called him elsewhere. When his father died he left for France to console his mother, without telling anyone where he was going; and while the authorities were madly scouring the country for the deserter, that individual was sitting quietly at home, engaged in the translation of one of Cicero's orations. Under the circumstances it is astonishing, not that Paul-Louis never carried a marshal's *bâton*, but that the government didn't save his *garde champêtre* the trouble of putting a bullet into him, many years before that event actually happened.

After several years of unrewarded toil with the army in Italy, the disgusted *chef d'escadron* secured his release from the service and withdrew to his country estate. But scarcely had he left one branch of the army when he began trying to enter another, in the face of Napoleon's determination to have nothing more to do with soldiers who had shown their lack of devotion by leaving his service once. He succeeded, however, and found conditions in Germany worse than they had been in Italy. The latter half of his life he spent on his farm at Luynes, quarreling with his neighbors, opposing the government — whatever its policy happened to be at the moment — chafing under the matrimonial yoke with a woman twenty-five years his junior, penning racy political pamphlets and learned treatises on themes from classical antiquity, and maintaining correspondences with other

bibliophiles as eccentric as himself, like Marquis Tacconi of Naples, for example, owner of a magnificent library, who was sent to the galleys because he forged bank-notes to buy books, although he never read one.

Books were frequently at the bottom of Courier's troubles as well. During one of his frequent periods of desertion, he was comfortably ensconced in the San Lorenzo library in Florence, examining a valuable manuscript copy of Longus's "Daphnis and Chloe," when he succeeded in dropping a blot of ink on the page. The controversy that ensued and the publicity given the principals brought Courier to the attention of the French Government again, and he came near paying the extreme penalty for desertion. This controversy is especially interesting for eliciting that delightfully complicated bit of satire directed at Italian librarians. If they weren't always seeking publicity by quarrels like the present one, says Courier, "no one would ever have suspected that they were so deplorably ignorant of their calling; and their stupidity, appearing only in their writings, would never have been known by any one."

Every man's hand was against the virtuous peasant to the end. "Every time I am robbed, I have to pay damages and interest thereon. If I were assaulted, I suppose I should be fined. I am now threatened with having my house burned. If that happens, I shall doubtless be punished for arson." One evening, he was shot by an unknown hand. Five years later, a peasant girl admitted that she had witnessed his death, and that he had been killed by his own game-warden. The matter was never satisfactorily cleared up, however, and Paul-Louis's death remains as enigmatic as his life.

There never was an author who lent himself more easily to extracts. His work, in fact, is merely a succession of piquant epigrams, some of them expressing profound truths. When Napoleon became emperor, "I thought him," says Courier, "made for something better." When it was proposed that his province contribute to the Royal Family the wherewithal to buy Chambord for the Duke of Bordeaux, the peasant of Luynes opposed the purchase, because, he says, the prince will lose more in the people's affection, than he will gain in land — "*. . . de tel-*

*les acquisitions le ruinerait bientôt, s'il est vrai, ce qu'on dit, que les princes ne sont riches que de l'amour des peuples.*" "Those who praise the past know only the present." But it was in personal satire that Courier was inimitable. Voltaire was a novice beside this spiteful wit. "The court gives everything to the prince, — just as the priest gives everything to God." "The friends of Louis XIV can't speak his language. We hear the praises of Bossuet, Racine, Fénelon, in the style of Marat." In the attack on the Academy, "*Vous cherchez cette médiocrité justement vantée par les sages.*" Apropos of the *émigrés*: "the emperor cherishes and reveres them, probably because he can't manufacture them, as he can counts and princes."

But even Paul-Louis isn't all bitterness and cynicism. What silken hanger-on at the despised court ever said prettier things to the ladies? "*Si je ne vous en ai pas adressé (de ma prose) plus tôt, c'est que nous autres, vieux cousins, nous n'écrivons guère à nos jeunes cousines sans savoir auparavant comment nos lettres seront reçues, n'étant pas, comme vous autres, toujours assurés de plaire. . . . je bâille, en vérité, comme un coffre; — vous, à cause de mon absence, là-bas, vous devez bâiller aussi comme une petite tabatière.*" And then there is occasional spontaneous humor of a broader sort: "I am entirely consoled for the loss of my canary, because I have found him again." "I've received the shirt, General, which you send me as a present. May God restore it to you, in this world or the next. . . ."

Farewell, Paul-Louis! Peace to thy ashes, and may the dust rest lightly on thy forgotten tomes! There are worse things in this world, mayhap in the next, than to be forgotten.

R. T. HOUSE.

Southwestern State Normal School, Oklahoma.

## THE "SPANISH TRAGEDY" AND "HAMLET."

The attribution of the lost play of "Hamlet" to Thomas Kyd lends additional interest to the relations between Kyd and Shakespeare. Resemblances of many kinds are noticeable among the works of the two writers. Such a coincidence as the following can hardly be accidental:

I had not thought that Alexandro's heart  
Had been envenomed with such extreme hate:  
But now I see that words have several works  
And there's no credit in the countenance.

*Sp. Tr.* 3—1.

and the words of Duncan:

. . . . . There's no art  
To find the mind's construction in the face.

It is, however, not in such verbal similarities that we find a relation between the dramatists of remarkable degree; it is rather in the similarity of treatment and conception between the great play of Kyd and the masterpiece of his successor.

The motive of both plays is revenge, in each for a murder. In "Hamlet" the murder is committed before the opening of the play and is revealed by supernatural means. In "The Spanish Tragedy" the murder, which forms part of the action, is revealed by means of a mysterious letter. None will forget the burst of human grief that almost vanquishes Hamlet at the moment he hears of his beloved father's death. Though there is no attempt to portray Hieronimo fully as a human character of many sides, he experiences sufficient grief and sorrow to cause him to lose his mental balance temporarily. Yet he is soon in full possession of his wits and suggests to his wife that their cue is to dissemble.

I hope to show that there is reason to believe that Shakespeare had "The Spanish Tragedy" in mind while writing "Hamlet" and that, though he followed it as a model, he improved it at many points. It is noteworthy as an illustration that at the point in "Hamlet," corresponding with the above suggestion from

Hieronimo, Hamlet makes the speech which contains the phrase "To put an antic disposition on." Shakespeare, however, was, I think, too shrewd a judge of human nature to imagine that Hamlet who had just been startled out of sane behaviour by the terrible revelation of the ghost could in the same moment, like Hieronimo, be so self-possessed as to plan on the instant the ruse of assuming a future cloak of madness. The antic disposition is doubtless the "wild and whirling words" that his fellows could not understand, the general incoherent behaviour that has preceded the utterance of the line, and which Hamlet fears may occur again under a similar strain.

The author of the crime is revealed to Hamlet by the ghost — to Hieronimo by a letter. Both persons instantly suspect the trustworthiness of their information. Hamlet's doubt is due to his belief in a well-known Elizabethan superstition: namely, that the devil possessed the power to appear in the likeness of a dead person in order to tempt a living. This is a doubt shared likewise by Horatio and may well bid Hamlet pause till he have better proof. Hieronimo, however, suspects from no cause. The detail is unmotivated.

However, both men suspect, and both men resolve to test the truth of the information which they have received. Hamlet most carefully plans the "Mousetrap" which, though it turns out in an unsuspected way, convinces him of his uncle's guilt. Hieronimo asserts that he must take time for investigation, but in reality does nothing. He merely waits till a second more convincing letter comes to him quite by accident. Just why this letter should be written is not quite clear. It is intended by Kyd to convey information to Hieronimo, but it is intended by its writer, Pedringano, to convey an appeal for relief to Lorenzo. Yet the substance of the letter is that most calculated to harden Lorenzo's heart. Hieronimo, who was before so ready to doubt the revealing letter, accepts this as true in every respect and considers his doubts as completely set at rest. Both Hamlet and Hieronimo are now ready to act upon their original information — and both allow their revenge to be delayed till the end of the play.

How can we account for this delay? The answer to the form-



er case is evident. Hamlet has planned to sit quietly by till the "Mousetrap" is finished and then compare notes with Horatio on his uncle's behaviour. But he is himself affected by the scene beyond the limits of his endurance. By interrupting the proceedings too soon, Hamlet causes the court to disperse with the impression that Hamlet, not Claudius, has made an exhibition of himself. Though Hamlet is himself convinced of his uncle's guilt, he realizes that he has so bungled the affair that he will be unable to convince others of anything but his own inability to act with reason. In the reaction of despondency he allows himself to be drawn away from Denmark; but the moment his spirit returns he hastens back to accomplish his revenge.

Why Hieronimo delays is not quite so evident, yet a similar scene to the above appears in the corresponding portion of "The Spanish Tragedy." Immediately upon the completion of his self-conviction, Hieronimo resolves to appeal to the king. He has every reason to believe that his appeal will be successful. Yet, when he comes to the point, he is so wrought up by his emotion that he cannot say what he intended to say, and at last dashes off the stage hysterically mad. As in "Hamlet," the impression left upon the court is exactly opposite to that intended by Hieronimo. In the sequence, however, Hieronimo merely remains quiescent until the end of the play. He has no excuse for inaction. When Bel-Imperia upbraids him for his delay he requests her to wait and to expect great things, but he offers no defence.

These two scenes cannot be dismissed without a word concerning the wild behaviour that occasionally characterizes both Hamlet and Hieronimo. This is not the place to consider in detail the question of Hamlet's madness. He is certainly not insane in the sense that Lear is insane; nor is he believed insane by any of the shrewder intellects of the play — nor is Hieronimo. The key to their wild behaviour is the same. Both have exceptionally passionate natures. The revelation of the ghost, the "Mousetrap," and the burial of Ophelia act so powerfully upon Hamlet's nature that he temporarily loses self-control, control, however, which he immediately regains. The same is true of the character of Hieronimo.

There are a few other similarities between the two characters. Immediately after the failure of the "Mousetrap," during a conversation with the queen, Hamlet conjures up a vision of his father come to chide him for his long delay.

"Do you come," says Hamlet, "your tardy son to chide, That, lapsed in time and passion, lets go by The important acting of your dread command?" Immediately after his failure to convey his appeal to the king, Hieronimo conjures up a vision of his son come to chide him for his delay. "And art thou come, Horatio," says Hieronimo, "from the depth To ask for justice in this upper earth, To tell thy father thou art unrevenge?"

Hamlet is spurred back to activity from the fit of despondency following the "Mousetrap" by the accidental sight of a company of Fortinbras's soldiers who remind him of his own unfinished debt of revenge. Similarly Hieronimo is spurred back to activity by the sight of a handkerchief dyed in his son's blood which he accidentally draws from his pocket.

When the end of the play is reached and the offenders are killed, both Hamlet and Hieronimo recognize the necessity of some public justification of their actions. Hieronimo delivers his own plea. For this, however, Hamlet's span of life is insufficient. Yet he dies, begging Horatio to do the office for him:

Absent thee from felicity awhile,  
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain  
To tell my story.

With this close parallelism in mind is not one likely to hazard the inference that Shakespeare's play may bear less resemblance to the lost "Hamlet" than to "The Spanish Tragedy?" It is hard to believe that the first quarto, which in all its larger and broader qualities so closely resembles the second, bears any close resemblance to the play by Kyd. This, if considered in the light of the above list of parallels, implies an almost inconceivable degree of self-imitation. On the other hand, one can easily imagine that Shakespeare, who borrowed not only plots, but other dramatic details that proved successful, would take for his model the most popular tragedy of his time, and adhere to it in

the main with the same fidelity illustrated, for instance, in "Romeo and Juliet." Yet he did in "Hamlet" what he had already done in "Romeo and Juliet." He transformed the unpoetic dross of the original into the poetic ore associated in our minds only with Shakespearian genius.

HENRY THEW STEPHENSON.

The University of Indiana, Bloomington.

## BEN JONSON AND THE CHARACTER-WRITERS.

The resemblance between the characters of Ben Jonson and those of the character-writers is in many particulars a quite obvious one. At a glance it may be seen in the list of the characters prefixed to "Every Man Out of His Humour." Here Jonson frankly adopts the "character" form. An examination of the other plays will reveal several points of resemblance, and suggest comparisons that may make clearer Jonson's dramatic method. It may be noted as significant that it is in the earlier plays that Jonson chiefly uses this "character" form. This form I shall hereafter call a "characterism," taking the word from Bishop Hall's "Characterisms of Virtues and Vices."

The source of the characterisms of Jonson and of the English character-writers is perhaps the same. The form was in fairly general use in England throughout the last half of the sixteenth century. Theophrastus was translated into Latin by Casaubon in 1592, and was reprinted in English in 1598. Although the influence of Theophrastus on Jonson is wholly an inference, that Jonson knew of him is certain. An indirect influence existed through Terence, who, according to La Bruyère, used Theophrastus as a model. Dr. E. C. Baldwin in an article on "Ben Jonson's Indebtedness to the Greek Character Sketch,"<sup>1</sup> makes very clear the fact that Jonson is indebted for much of "Epicoene" and for something of "Volpone" to a character sketch by Libanius on, "A Morose man who has married a talkative wife denounces himself." Dr. Baldwin appears to have confused the matter by implying an identity between this dramatic sketch and the characterisms of Theophrastus. The difference is a difference in kind, as the title of the sketch suggests. It is the difference that exists between the list prefixed to "Every Man Out of His Humour," and the quite different kind prefixed to "The New Inn."

Theophrastus is, of course, the source and model of the English character-writers. Hall testifies to this in the preface to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, November, 1901.

his "Virtues and Vices" (1608). Overbury (1614) and Earle (1628) testify their great obligation to Hall. These very popular character-writers may have got suggestions from Jonson; but their form was from Theophrastus, and for the popularity that it quickly attained in the seventeenth century was able to stand by itself. Overbury went through eighteen editions before 1664.

In the introduction to "Every Man Out of His Humour" Jonson suggests his purpose in

I'll strip the ragged follies of the time  
Naked as at their birth.

His purpose was to reform society through satire. The purpose of Theophrastus was to mend the manners of men, and much in the words of Jonson, Bishop Hall has in his preface: "Lo here then Virtue and Vice stript naked to open view."

This usual purpose of satire, Jonson and the character-writers carried out by much the same method. Theophrastus described a quality and then personified it, and made it vivid by recounting the actions and manners of the man dominated by it. Overbury says very definitely: "To square out a character by our English level, it is a picture (real or personal) quaintly drawn in various colors, all of them heightened by one shadowing. It is a quick and soft touch on many strings all shutting up in one musical close; it is wit's descant on any plain song." Jonson's familiar definition of "a Humour" from the Induction to "Every Man Out of His Humour" may be given here for ready comparison:

As when some peculiar quality  
Doth so possess a man, that it doth draw  
All his effects, his spirits and his powers,  
In their confluxions, all to run one way,  
This may be truly said to be a humour.

What Jonson and the character-writers did was to present certain types acting under the influence of a dominant characteristic. The man existed to exhibit the characteristic; his identity was lost in it.

For realizing its purpose satire has two methods: it exhibits



its victims by describing their follies, and it presents them in acts of folly. The dramatic is, of course, the method of action.

In his early plays Jonson was too much interested in getting all of the details into the picture to let the plot interfere with his character types. He used action as an essayist uses anecdote, or as La Bruyère, the character-writer did — merely to make more vivid the personification of the humour. As an example, chosen at random, take the exercises in the training of a gallant in "Cynthia's Revels,"<sup>2</sup> or the scene of Shift and his rapier in "Every Man Out of His Humour." The sort of action found here is not dramatic action, it is merely illustration of character-humour.

So his method in each detail presses home his purpose: he gives his *personæ* names indicative of their characters, he gives summaries of what they are like in introduction, he makes their fellow characters describe them, and he almost always has a character or two to act as a chorus<sup>3</sup> to the peculiar manners of each one. The manners are reproduced in a pageant of figures brilliant and superficial; intellectual in concept rather than emotional, or sympathetic; undramatic in effect, and, it must be confessed, rather tedious to read connectedly. They are bright flashes of light on seventeenth century society, rather than character interpretations. So they produce precisely the effect that the pictures of Overbury and Earle produce.

Jonson's comedies have often been criticised for lack of character evolution; the criticism is really irrelevant as applied, at least, to the early comedies. In them the sort of character that can evolve is exceptional. What is there is manners and habits personified. If Jonson or Overbury were writing to-day, they would give vivid snap-shots of "a baseball fan," a "sport," "a street-car hog," or "a frenzied financier."

Just where the line should be drawn distinguishing characteristics and character is quite naturally not clear. An illustration or two may be in point. Lady Politick Would-be, in "Volpone," though not organically a part of the plot is a type of

<sup>2</sup> III, iii.

<sup>3</sup> Macilente, Buffone, Crites, Horace, Truewit, Volpone.

what a character-writer would call "a talkative woman;" but she is presented as such dramatically. She does not suggest a characterism of "a talkative woman," because she has dramatic individuality. She is not summarized in a collection of descriptive phrases that at last might fail in making anything but an harmonious abstraction of her. The talk about Gratiano's talkativeness, in "The Merchant of Venice," is not undramatic. It is aptly worked into the action, and illustrated under its movement, and made vital by being both individual and universal. No one can regret this clever thumb-nail characterism sketched on the action of "As You Like It:" "Farewell Monsieur Traveller: Look you lisp and wear strange suits, disable all the benefits of your own country, be out of love with your own nativity, and almost chide God for making you the countenance you are, or I will scarce think you have swam in a gondola."<sup>4</sup>

With this Overbury's "An Affected Traveller" may be compared for likenesses no less than differences. What is incidental in Shakespeare is a large part of Jonson's main purpose. Bobadil, whom Jonson calls "a Paul's man," and Pantilius Tucca, whom he calls "a profane man" are truly dramatic characters. The difference between them and the types "a Paul's man" and "a profane man" of the character-writers is too wide to need pointing out; but it is no wider than the difference between Bobadil and most of Jonson's humour creations.

It is commonly said that satire is liable to two dangers: on the one side, in being typical, it is in danger of being too vague; on the other, in being the result of observation, it is in danger of becoming altogether personal and temporary. The figures in Jonson's comedies of "humour," where the "humour" idea has free play, fail of large interest for both of these reasons. In the character-writers and in Jonson the figures are at once too particular and too general. Shakespeare's traveller is not widely away from a present type, but Overbury's traveller, although drawn with great particularity and deftness of touch, has disappeared with his tooth-pick and St. Martin's. Jonson used the

---

<sup>4</sup>"As You Like It," III, v.

same particularity and the same obscuring multiplicity of detail. With such a method it is not surprising that he should write so personal a play as "The Poetaster," and that he should put into his plays pictures of his enemies that remain strictly individual. English character-writers did not in Jonson's day, make their characterisms personal hits. Although each "character" bristles with particularities of folly, the figures themselves are usually as colorless as ghosts. So it happens that the English "character" for its vagueness is on the side of the essay rather than on the side of the novel or of the drama; and we are not surprised to find in Overbury not only the character of "a prisoner," but the so-called "character of a prison," and in Earle, characters of "a tavern," and of "a bowle alley," and of "Paul's Walk,"—or as we should now call it, an essay on Paul's Walk.

The character-writers are an accepted source of Sir Roger de Coverley. The character-writers were known to Addison, and it may be presumed not unfairly that they were a source. But in accepting the statement because the contrary cannot be proved, it seems clear that the vitality that is in Sir Roger is not a mere addition to the country-knight of Earle, any more than to the country-gull of Jonson with whom Sir Roger seems an impossible comparison. In the *Spectator* we have a complete transformation. Thackeray's snobs come nearer the "character" type than Sir Roger.

From the illustrations cited it will appear that in seeking subjects for analysis Jonson and the character-writers often used the same material. This is true. Their courtiers and their countrymen are entirely typical. Jonson labels his, for example, "Fastidious Brisk," and "Sordido;" the same types appear in the character books as "an affected courtier" and "a plain country fellow." The characterism of Sordido prefixed to "Every Man Out of His Humour," is as follows: "A wretched hobnailed chuff, whose recreation is reading of almanacs, and felicity foul weather. One that never prayed but for a lean dearth, and ever wept in a fat harvest."

Earle devotes two pages to a "plain country fellow" who is one "that manures his ground wel, but lets himself lie fallow

and untill'd. Hee has reason enough to doe his businesse, and not enough to be idle or melancholy. . . . His mind is not much distracted with objects; but if a good fat Cowe come in his way, he stands dumbe and astonisht, and though his haste bee never so great, will fixe here a halfe houre's contemplation. . . . Yet if hee (his landlord) give him leave, he is a good Christian to his power, (that is) comes to Church in his best clothes and sits there with his Neighbours, where he is capable only of two Prayers, for raine and faire weather. . . . Hee thinks nothing to be vices but Pride and ill-husbandry, from which he will gravely disswade youth; and has some thrifty Hobnaylor Proverbes to Clout his discourse. . . ."

The people of Jonson's comedies are to a great extent the people of the character-writers. They make an unpleasant society. The characters of Jonson, Overbury and Earle associated in parallel columns will be found to be duplicating lists of gulls, upstart country knights, malcontents, smelts, hobnailed-chuffs, thread-bare sharks, usurers, hypocritical puritans, affected travellers, and parasites. A great deal of the presentation is vivid, even brilliant. As character dissection it has flashes of keen interest, but the character-writers and Jonson, in his early plays, present character not at all.

With the great plays of Jonson's middle period comparison with the character-writers fails, and for a significant reason. In "Volpone," "Epicœne," "The Alchemist," and "Bartholomew Fair," Jonson uses much the same figures from contemporary life that he used in his earlier comedies, but he subordinates them to his plot. In the process, the characters as characters lose nothing, they greatly gain. His feeling for them remains that of the analytic satirist; but there is genuine construction in the construction of the plot, and so in the relation of the characters to the plot. A comparison of the characters of Macilente and Morose as representations of men somewhat similar in disposition, will reveal a striking difference of method in relating these central figures of "Every Man Out of His Humour" and "Epicœne" to the other characters, and in relating the characteristics of these central figures to the plot. The difference is, roughly speaking, that between the characterism and the drama.

In his "New Inn" Jonson recurred to the method of giving a descriptive account of his characters. This is the character of Frank given there: "Frank, supposed to be a boy and the host's son, borrowed to be dressed for a lady, and set as a stale by Prudence to catch Beaufort or Latimer, proves to be Lætitia, sister to Frances, and Lord Frampul's younger daughter stolen by a beggar woman, shorn, put into boy's apparel, sold to the host and brought up by him as his son." And so for the others.

Here Jonson is thinking of the plot. Of characterization there is really none. This has no connection with the character-writing of Theophrastus or that of Overbury and Earle. In the evolution of his dramatic art Jonson's characters remain superficially the same, in reality they undergo a change that is fundamental.

EDWARD K. GRAHAM.

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.



## THE CHARACTER OF VICTOR HUGO'S "RUY BLAS."

The character of Ruy Blas is one difficult of interpretation.<sup>1</sup> To many critics the brilliant, ambitious lackey-minister seems as puzzling as the young, dreamy Danish prince was to the court at Elsinore. Doumic says he is entirely too silly. Brunetière considers his conduct at times as improbable and inexplicable. Marzials goes so far as to "express disbelief in him altogether." A careful analysis of the character of Ruy Blas, the details of which are given in the subsequent paragraphs of this paper, reveals the fact that he is withal a hero *par excellence* of the romantic ideals in literature.

Before proceeding to this analysis, it is only fair to the author to allow him to state his own purpose in creating such a character. In his preface to "Ruy Blas," Hugo declares that the hero represents the struggling and aspiring people who have the future but not the present. The people for whom Ruy Blas stands are orphans, poor, intelligent, and strong; placed very low, and aspiring very high; having upon their backs the marks of servitude and in their hearts the premeditations of genius. Ruy Blas is, therefore, to be considered as the symbol of a rising people struggling towards the light, and the type of an ambitious, longing, dreamy parvenu.

Hugo's method of portraying a dramatic character is to select a central idea, a logical formula, or a social antithesis, and then make his character conform to this. The wicked Lucrezia Borgia has a true mother's heart. Into the deformed, scheming Triboulet he puts the affection of a father. The thoughts and actions of the bandit Hernani are worthy of a king. Gomez,

---

<sup>1</sup>For the canons of interpretation to be observed in the study of a dramatic character, see my articles on "The Characters in Victor Hugo's 'Hernani,'" in THE SEWANEE REVIEW for April and October, 1905. The present article is one of a series of studies in Hugo's method of portraying characters. This study of the character of Ruy Blas, which will be perhaps the most exhaustive of all my articles on Hugo's dramatic characters, is almost wholly inductive.

who sacrifices even his sweetheart for the sake of his honor, is guilty of a most monstrous act of revenge. Ruy Blas entertains beneath the clothing of a lackey the passions of a king. These social antitheses, inevitably exhibiting many and varied contradictory qualities in the same character, partake of the nature of the epic. As in a novel, many individual traits and details, whether important or trivial, essential or accidental, are presented. This exaggerated individualization, assisted by costumes and disguises, leads naturally to a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde dualism. As a consequence, most of Hugo's important dramatic characters must be examined and treated as two men, one representing the inner life or lyricism, the other representing the outer life or the epic, or the one standing for one sort of a man and the other for exactly the opposite. In order, therefore, to interpret intelligently and scientifically one of Hugo's heroes, these contradictory qualities must be discovered and harmonized.

This analysis applied to "Ruy Blas" does not progress very far before we discover that Ruy Blas, the hero, is both a lackey and a minister. His intellectual endowments are strong enough to make him a powerful executive, but his social qualities and moral characteristics weaken his will and make him a dreamer, thereby unfitting him for decisive action in critical moments. Educated in a "college of science and pride" to become a workman, he ends in becoming a lackey. Instead of developing his intellectual qualities and playing a man's part in the realities of an active life, he grows faint-hearted and spends his time in idleness and ignominy. His inaction leads to the forming of a mountain of projects, to the longing for wealth, power, and social position, and finally to social degradation and moral failure. In view of all this, it is easily seen that he is in his natural state when he is a lackey and in a disguised condition when he is a minister; that when he is a lackey he is essentially true to his character as a whole, and that when he is prime minister, though there is still a vestige of the lackey left, he is true, above all, to the intellectual side or an accidental phase of his character.

Let us study, in the first place, this intellectual or accidental phase of the character of Ruy Blas. It is not by his own effort

but through an external power that he is raised to the height of political power. In this position of a statesman, imposed upon him by his master, his own individuality is not allowed full sway, but he is upheld by the personality of another. As long as his practical powers are sustained by this external force, he appears great and even colossal. As soon, however, as this external power, in the form of the exiled Don Salluste, makes its appearance, Ruy Blas's own personality becomes involved, and he lamentably fails. Like the dove under the powerful and irresistible fascination of the serpent, Ruy Blas yields to that unaccountable, infatuating exterior force. Up to the sudden and unexpected appearance of this exiled master, our hero has risen rapidly and displayed remarkable powers as a statesman. The fate of the young dreamer becomes only the more pathetic and tragic when we realize that he is, in his political position, the victim not of society nor of his own character, but of a cold, heartless, intellectual villain.

The external power that controls the political rise of Ruy Blas is not limited to the revengeful Marquis of Finlas. While it is true that the latter is the motive force of evil that is pushing him on relentlessly and contrary to the young man's will, there is an opposite motive force of good directing his political career towards the highest office in the gift of the throne. This directing force is none other than the melancholy and lonely queen, who instinctively recognizes the ability of the young man. Inspired by admiration for his genius and love for himself, as well as by the need of a strong and firm hand to guide the nation in its hour of peril, she promotes him rapidly from the position of equerry to that of prime minister. Within the remarkably short period of six months the queen appoints him equerry, universal secretary, and prime minister, decorates him with the golden fleece, and creates him Duke of Olmedo. One of the councilors, suspecting that some one behind the scenes is mysteriously helping him in the attainment of these honors,<sup>3</sup> suggests that

---

<sup>3</sup> This rapid promotion of Ruy Blas is much more unnatural than that of Wallenstein or Claude Melnotte, the former not being of such a low station in life as Ruy Blas, and the latter requiring two and one half years to rise to the rank of Colonel in the French Army, where promotion is usually quick.

his good fortune is due to the queen who rules over him while he rules over them. The queen even goes so far as to tell Ruy Blas that he seems to her to be the real king, the real master, and frankly acknowledges to him that it is she who has made him mount by degrees to the summit. "Where God should have placed you," she says, "a woman puts you."

While the power of evil is directing him from afar, the power of good is close at hand. Under the immediate influence of this benignant force, Ruy Blas grows in influence and accomplishes splendid achievements for his queen. Not until this power is withdrawn and the hostile power reappears, does the new prime minister fall. Moreover, one external power plans only good for him, and the other plots ultimate evil. When the first comes into contact with Ruy Blas's intellectual life, there is a tendency to rise, but when the latter comes into conflict with this intellectual life, the personality of the lackey-duke is involved, and the result of this collision is disastrous. As long then as Ruy Blas's assumed character is unknown to one of these external powers, all goes well, but as soon as he is in the presence of one who penetrates his disguise, there is a collapse. His disguise discovered or thrown off, he is the dreaming, longing lackey; his disguise resumed, he is the intellectual prime minister. So far, then, his success is due, not to his own passions and deeds, but to events and circumstances; not to his own will, but to the will of others. This intensified intellectual and practical phase of the life of Ruy Blas contributes to the inconsistency and improbability of his character, a notable mark of the Romantic literature of the period, and especially of Victor Hugo, its ablest and most distinguished exponent.

Another external force, independent of the master and the queen, is fate. The particular fatality that relentlessly pursues Ruy Blas is his low birth. As long as this social condition remains in the background without taking an active part in influencing and controlling the career of Ruy Blas, his success is assured; but as soon as he is in the presence of that external power that is cognizant of his social station, this fatality manifests its power and inevitableness. The fate, therefore, of the young aspiring lackey is latent in his past in the form of his low

birth, and in his evil genius in the person of the wicked Don Saluste; and it can be averted only in part by the presence of his good angel in the person of the queen. Finally, however, the good in and around him is overcome by the evil, symbolized by his intriguing master and the fatality of his ignoble birth.

The intellectual and political history of Ruy Blas, as influenced by these three external forces, is clearly traced in the antecedent action and in the progress of the rising action of the drama. Like Figaro and Hamlet, he has been to college. In this "college of science and pride," he has been taught a trade; he therefore knows how to do things. He is, furthermore, represented as having many accomplishments. He sings, writes a fine hand, composes verses, is an orator, and has the reputation of being the most accomplished man in Spain. The councillors recognize his ability, declaring that they have a master who will be great, a Richelieu, if not an Olivarez. Like Melnotte and Clavigo, he is a genius who knows everything and can do everything. His brilliant and trained mind knows causes and effects, wills, judges, and resolves. The queen tells him that he has a sublime mind in his head, and that genius is his crown. She wonders why he is ignorant of nothing, whence comes his voice that speaks as the voice of kings ought to speak, and why he is as terrible and great as God himself would have been. As a minister he is capable of decisive acts of will, and knows the secret of impelling others to such actions as will produce a collision of forces. His oratory is impressive and convincing, and his patriotism unbounded. Being a man of genius, his actions are mysterious to those by whom he is surrounded. In the absence of his evil master, his powerful personality is felt by the whole empire, commanding the respect of the councillors and the admiration of the queen. His upright character and strong personality, when his intellectual powers are at their highest, win the pure and romantic love of the queen, evoking from her the remarkable declaration: "I give you my soul. Queen for all, for you I am only a woman." Thus his intellectual qualifications are sufficient; but his moral and social qualities, his character and personality are insufficient to enable him to attain complete and final success. Genius without birth cannot make a minister



out of a lackey or a nobleman out of a peasant. There is, thus, according to Hugo's logical formula of social antitheses, an external barrier between the upper and lower classes. With him, blood does tell.

Furthermore, costume assists in indicating the intellectual and political life of Ruy Blas. It helps to distinguish his social rank and to bring out the antithesis. It is not so much an historical costume as an artistic one, for it is adapted to the character rather than to the epoch. By the use of costume the dominant traits, passions, moods, and particular temperament of a character may be made known. The appropriate use of costume lends an element of concreteness and individuality to a character. When Don Salluste, for example, introduces Ruy Blas at court, the latter is clothed in a costume befitting his new station. He puts on a scarf of the latest style, and wears a magnificent sword, with a splendid hilt of the workmanship of the famous engraver Gil; he also wears a hat. Later, in the recognition scene between him and the queen, Ruy Blas is magnificently clothed, with a mantle falling over his left arm. In the council chamber he is arrayed in black velvet, with a cloak of scarlet velvet, wearing a white feather in his cap and the golden fleece on his neck. These costumes are symbolic, the black indicating seriousness and dignity, the scarlet being emblematic of his power as prime minister.

By means of costume, moreover, Hugo can easily disguise his characters. He not only constantly uses this scenic process, but he frequently abuses it. Rochester, in "Cromwell," is disguised as a Puritan and Ormond as a Round Head. Hernani is disguised as a bandit, and on one occasion he employs the melodramatic device of a double disguise — that of a bandit and a pilgrim. Ruy Blas is disguised as a nobleman. As Franz Moor's conscience could be stretched to suit the occasion, so this disguise can be assumed or discarded at will. This changing of the costume to suit the character and the occasion, a device employed so strikingly by Shakespeare, Schiller, and Scott, not to mention other great romantic writers, facilitates the portrayal of concrete complex characters, with all their numerous qualities, whether consistent or contradictory. It is characteristic, too,

rather of comedy than of tragedy, and aids Hugo very materially in illustrating his theory of the mixture of tones in the same composition, and, more particularly, of the mingling of the grotesque and the sublime in the same character.

In passing from the accidental to the essential, from the assumed character to the real character, it will be necessary to note that this element of the intellectual will also form a part of the real and complete personality of Ruy Blas. Like Shakespeare's women who, disguised as men, preserve their sex-distinguishing characteristics, Ruy Blas, as a lackey, nevertheless possesses to a certain extent that mental quality which had been developed to its highest capacity by means of a certain concentration of his innate powers, aided by great crises and external wills. These external forces largely eliminated, he falls back naturally and inevitably upon his own resources both of natural endowments and acquired powers. All of these traits combined form his peculiar individuality, and it is this individuality and personality that determines and controls his actions. The sum of all these traits, attainments, experiences, and deeds, assisted by powerful and striking situations as well as by outward forces and circumstances, forms his real character.

This real character of Ruy Blas is seen in its highest and completest form when he is in the presence of both Don Salluste and the queen; for he is then both lackey and minister. It is on such occasions that he is in possession and command of all his complex powers, faculties, and characteristics. It is at that point, when to the queen he is minister and to her enemy he is lackey, that he kills Don Salluste. He is great when he throws off his disguise and confesses to the queen his treasonable duplicity. Then his strength of will, powerful intellect, versatility, quickness and skill are almost as remarkable as those of Iago and Don Salluste. Like Corneille's heroes, his will is then unconquerable. His own will, assisted by the external force of good, can do wonders. When Ruy Blas is in the presence of the queen, his will is able to struggle against his fatality and finally to triumph over it. His will, seconded by love, his good angel, wins over fatality seconded by his evil genius. His sin of will and taint of blood will, it seems, somehow end in good.

O, yet we trust that somehow good  
Will be the final goal of ill,  
To pangs of nature, sins of will,  
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood.

This real character of Ruy Blas is carefully and even minutely portrayed in the text. We are reminded from time to time that Ruy Blas is intended to be not a mere typical person, with general and universal characteristics, but a concrete individual, having certain mental and physical qualities, undergoing certain physical, mental, and emotional experiences, and entertaining a variety of conflicting motives. We are never, for one moment, allowed to forget that he has a body. The introduction of various little details lends reality to the representation of his physical existence. His dreams, longings, desires, ambitions, deeds, failures and successes are represented to our imagination or presented before our eyes. His genius and accomplishments, his ministerial duties and doings, and his love affairs are equally and unequivocally confided sooner or later to the public. Though the councillors may wonder at his mysterious actions, and though the queen may not until the very last know the low origin of his birth, yet the spectators know all they could possibly need to know to follow intelligently the workings of his mind, his plans and purposes, his motives and deeds, and the successes or failures of his projects. In short, his real character, mental, moral, and physical, with all its traits, contradictions, acquisitions, and possibilities is, epically and lyrically, in true romantic fashion, revealed to us in concrete form.

In painting the portrait of Ruy Blas, Hugo indicates his physical qualities. True to his theory of the portrayal of a romantic character, the author provides his hero with a body, giving in detail its individual, material, and exterior traits and features which give particular reality to the character, however complex it may be. By means of numerous local and casual details, scrupulously eliminated by the French classical writers of tragedy, Hugo gives an exact reproduction of a concrete individual. In the first place, he endows his creations with a certain age, physiognomy, nervous sensibility, and temperament. The eye of Ruy Blas, irritated but without fury, overwhelms the council-

lors with flashes, and his voice speaks like that of kings. The queen is charmed by his eyes and captivated by his voice. He and Don César so much resemble each other that they would be taken for brothers; Don Salluste observes that they have the same air and the same visage. When dressed up by Don Salluste, Ruy Blas looks like a perfect nobleman. Specific costumes assist in making known his age and physical aspects. Enough distinctive physical traits are added to distinguish and individualize his character. Instead of idealizing these physical traits, as the classicists insisted should be done in the interest of universal, essential truth, Hugo carefully determines the physiognomy in the interest of a particular reality. Under this canon of romantic dramatic art, Ruy Blas is represented, not as a moral condition, an abstract idea, an ideal figure, or a typical being, but as a concrete, real man, having a particular, individualized body.

Not only physical qualities but physical experiences emphasize Ruy Blas's physical reality. While the physical characteristics of Ruy Blas are more sparingly given than is usual in the case of Hugo's heroes, the author more than makes up for this paucity of traits by the physical experiences the lackey-minister is made to undergo. The antecedent action contributes definite information as to his early education, aspirations and actions. He himself tells us that he was an orphan, born among the people, and educated in a college of science and pride. He speaks of that happy time of joy and sorrow when he lived homeless, when he was hungry in the day and cold at night, but when he was free. He and Don César sang together at dawn, and in the evening slept together beneath the star-lit sky. He passed whole days, pensive and idle, before some magnificent palace, watching the duchesses come in and go out. One day, dying of hunger upon the pavement, the thriftless young man picked up a piece of bread where he found it. When he was twenty years old, believing in his genius, the idle dreamer, walking barefooted in the roads, lost himself in meditations upon the lot of humanity. Lately he has been living in Don Salluste's mysterious house, the companion and master of two black mutes. He waits every day in the passage-way to catch a glimpse of the queen, with

whom he is in love, and of whom he dreams every night. He gathers German blue-flowers, out of which he makes bouquets, and, like Romeo and Ne'er-Do-Well, he climbs at night over walls and iron-gratings, in order to place these bouquets upon a bench in the park where the queen can get them.

As we pass, however, from the antecedent action to the action proper of the drama, these various details, marking his actual physical experiences, become, of course, much more numerous. The aspiring lackey continues to provide the queen with flowers, even daring to accompany one of his bouquets with a letter. In the course of the action he is represented as wearing and changing various articles of dress, standing with head uncovered, shaking hands, bowing, addressing the councillors, writing and signing letters, closing the door, opening a window, falling upon a chair, cutting his hand, carrying messages, trembling, tottering, swooning, picking up and kissing a piece of lace, crossing his arms, kneeling to the queen, raising his eyes to heaven, locking a door, walking with great strides up and down the room, praying in a church, drawing a phial from his bosom, weeping, hiding his head in his hands, reading a letter by the light of a lamp, taking the queen by the hands or holding her in his arms, seizing the sword of Don Salluste, pushing him into a closet, killing the revengful, heartless villain, and finally dying.

Thus we have represented, not to our imagination simply, but almost wholly before our very eyes, the hero's physical attitudes, emotions, and actions. In this way romantic drama emphasizes the drama of life at the expense of the drama of conscience, the physiological at the expense of the psychological. While the classical dramatist presents the inner life of its heroes, rather than the outer life, romantic drama emphasizes the outer rather than the inner. Instead of selecting a few general traits and experiences, the romantic dramatist gives a multiplicity of details, many of them necessarily trivial. He endows his hero not with a few essential qualities but with a number of accidental characteristics. A premium and an emphasis are thus placed upon the commonplace, the trivial, and the insignificant. Ruy Blas is thereby presented not as an abstract idea but as a concrete reality. He stands not for the nobility, but for the people,



the masses, and in order to symbolize the people, it was necessary to make him a complex, concrete being.

Ruy Blas is furthermore endowed with certain distinguishing mental, moral, and social qualities, certain individualizing emotions and passions, and is made to undergo various mental experiences. He has a fine mind, but when the influence of his good angel is withdrawn he suffers from a weak will. Being a man of genius he indulges in day-dreaming, building a mountain of projects, and longing to do great things. As a minister, he is able, brilliant, eloquent, great, powerful, practical, sagacious, firm, courageous, patriotic, hopeful, honest, upright, intoxicated with power, and self-sufficient. As a lover, he is true, loyal, sincere, considerate, proud, passionate, jealous, fascinated, melancholy, despondent, suffering, despairing, and mad. As a lackey, or rather perhaps as a man, he is all these and more, with the exception, as pointed out above, that, as a minister, his intellectual qualities are emphasized and intensified by his peculiar environment. The lackey is represented, more or less fully, in the text as respectful, obedient, faithful, discreet, cautious, timorous, sensitive, ambitious, longing, dreaming, purposeless, given to revery, morbid, religious, sentimental, poetical, diffident, disconcerted, hopeless, fearless, fatal, patient, good, honorable, inexorable, and infatuated. As a man, Ruy Blas possesses, however paradoxical the statement may seem, all these qualities, which are now to be brought into harmony with one another.

Possessed of these various qualities and faculties, animated by these numerous emotions and passions, and actuated by these conflicting motives, Ruy Blas, like *Hernani*, symbolizes the modern complex man. A hero, incarnating such a multiplicity of contradictory powers, passions, and motives, cannot help engaging in many struggles, both inward and outward. His own will is in unremitting conflict with itself, and constantly meeting with active and determined opposition and persecution from without. His character is being continuously molded and developed by circumstances, by obstacles seemingly insurmountable, by superior external forces, by a relentless fatality, and by his own acts, thoughts, and aspirations. His fate is thus deter-

mined both by his own deeds, errors, and weaknesses, and by external powers over which he has no control. Artistically, his fall, latent in his deeds, whether crimes or mistakes, and in his environment, is inevitable and indispensable.

Ruy Blas, like many of Hugo's other characters, is endowed with contradictory qualities and actuated by discordant motives. His inconsistent actions are presented, explained, and harmonized in various ways. In the first place, while most dramatic writers represent characters serving as foils to each other, Hugo enlarges the field of the art of characterization by making a character serve as a foil to himself. Instead of representing the classical simplicity of character and singleness of motive, necessitated by the narrow rules of time, place, and action, which limit the classical dramatist to one mood or one crisis, Hugo extends the time and place indefinitely so as to include many moods and many crises. By this means the development of character, a variety of emotions, passions, and qualities, and a number of important events and great crises can be exhibited without violating probability or naturalness. This question of probability or naturalness of an action does not, however, trouble Hugo, whose violent and improbable mixture of dissimilar elements in the same drama and antithetical traits in the same character has become a commonplace of Hugo criticism.

Another method of presenting apparently irreconcilable qualities and actions is to employ the comic and melodramatic device of disguises. Opposed to a hero's real character is his assumed character, and this assumed character is indicated by a disguise of some sort. While Iago is two-faced and Tartuffe is a hypocrite, Ruy Blas, like *Hernani*, shows his double character by means of costumes. Shakespeare's Edgar and Hamlet assume the disguise of madness. Nor is this idea of a double rôle confined to the moderns, for the Zeus of Æschylus and the Admetus of Euripides, among others, exhibited inconsistent phases of character.

Furthermore, Hugo, like Scott, often emphasizes this element of antithesis in another and a striking manner: he employs the device of allowing a character to lay fantastic stress upon one virtue or passion or motive at the expense of others. Gomez,

for example, engages in a great struggle between love and honor, in which the latter wins; but later vengeance triumphs over honor. Rather than violate his oath, Hernani would say, with Brian de Bois Gilbert in "Ivanhoe:" "Many a law, many a commandment have I broken, but my word never." Don César, the friend and companion of Ruy Blas, is guilty of innumerable crimes against the state, the church, and humanity, but all Don Salluste's persuasion, threats and bribes cannot induce him to assist the villain in wreaking vengeance upon a weak and helpless woman. Like the Corsair, the names of many of Hugo's characters are

Linked with one virtue, and a thousand crimes.

It is in this fantastic way, that Hugo makes a character serve as a foil to himself, and display characteristics and motives that are absolutely incongruous and contradictory. This manner of portraying a character, which has been facetiously called antithesis raised to the second degree, is a striking illustration of Hugo's theory of the mingling of the sublime and the grotesque in art. The author is, so to speak, "consistently inconsistent."

Hugo is not the only writer of modern times who ascribes contradictory qualities to the same character. No less a dramatist than Shakespeare deigns to present a man — *homo et vir* — with his manifold qualities, many of them being opposite or inconsistent. Opposite qualities and incompatible moral forces are carefully blended in his Henry V, Coriolanus, and Angelo. In a most impressive manner the character of Julius Cæsar is made to appear as possessed of the most noble and sublime endowments, as well as of low and trivial traits. The character of Brutus illustrates how it takes a combination of dissimilar qualities to make a man:

His life was gentle; and the elements  
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

The contradictions are thus completely and artistically harmonized.

This element of mediævalism is exemplified, also, in the early

dramas of Schiller and in one or two of Goethe's plays. The Robber Moor gives his money to orphans and supports promising young men at college. Goethe's Goetz von Berlichingen and Faust have "two souls in their breast" which are engaged in constant warfare with each other. Later, also, German Romanticism is full of "reduplication of selves."

In English romanticism, Scott and Byron are particularly remarkable for their portrayal of characters possessing contradictory qualities, the characters of the former being revealed by their outward actions and those of the latter by their inward conflicts. The deformed and eccentric Meg Merrilies, the "harlot, thief, witch, and gipsy," is noted for her virtuous deeds. Macaulay, in his essay on Byron, speaks of certain characters of Byron, like Manfred and Sardanapalus, as having contradictory qualities, as being exhibited in a sharp antithetical way, as having ascribed to them as many contradictory qualities as possible, as being made up of startling contrasts, disgusting inconsistencies, and grotesque, monstrous traits.

One of the first characteristics of Ruy Blas that strikes our attention is his ambition. Like Melnotte, his prototype, he had in his early youth he knew not what ambition. Without the spur, however, of external powers such as the planning of Don Salluste and the love of the queen, his ambition becomes that of a chimerical *déclassé*. With the help of these forces his ambition knows no reasonable bounds. His ambition is not such as to make him say with Macbeth:

I have no spur  
To prick the sides of my intent, but only  
Vaulting ambition,

but rather he could say to himself,

What thou wouldst highly, that wouldst thou holily.

Nor is his ambition personal, like that of Macbeth; nor is it regardless of the public welfare, like that of Hotspur. Like Lady Macbeth, he thinks only of the interest of his lover, or, like Brutus, of his country; and like Hamlet, he feels that the world is out of joint, and that he was born to set it right; but also, as in the case of the Danish prince, he finds that evil is too cunning,

too strong for him. He pitied the misfortunes of Spain, and believed that the world needed him; but in himself he was not equal to the task of a statesman or a reformer. His ambition has been fitly called the ambition of equality, making him rise to the height of the queen or causing her to fall to his own level.

By the side of this definite, active ambition of Ruy Blas is an indefinite, passive ambition, characterized by a certain vague longing to do something or to be somebody. While at college, he became a dreamer instead of a workman. He passed his days and nights in fruitless meditations upon the lot of human beings, in cherishing an indescribable, indefinite ambition in his heart, in building air-castles, in entertaining fond but unavailing hopes, and in fostering a belief in his genius. This idealist, dreaming the dreams of youth, indulging in vain speculations, proposing to himself tasks to which he is unequal, dreaming of the impossible and the unattainable, yearning for something just beyond his reach, spends his time in that morbid reflection which leads to inaction and failure. Whatever resolution he may form is "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." His academic and philosophical mind, when suddenly brought into contact with the strenuous world of action, wastes too much precious time in "thinking too precisely on the event." Naturally there is only one destiny for such impractical longings, and that is practical failure. Such men as Hamlet, Lorenzo, Brutus, Posa, Karl Moor, Wallenstein, Parzival, Werther, René, Manfred, Hernani, and Ruy Blas, however high-minded, cultivated, and well-intentioned they may be, are looked upon by practical men as visionary, impractical, ingenuous, unbalanced, and devoid of common sense.

Such dreamers, while, as in the case of Ruy Blas, they often attain almost the topmost round of fortune's ladder, suffer eventually ignominious failures. Like Moses, they get in sight of the promised land, but they are unable to reach the final goal for which they have longed and yearned. Their impractical longings are unrealized, their idealistic dreams are shattered, and their splendid air-castles have toppled to ruin. The somnambulist Ruy Blas wakes too late from his dreams, and then he realizes that he has been only a dreamer. He learns too late that



"life is real, life is earnest." As a result, partly of this dreaminess, Ruy Blas neglects to anticipate the return of his master, and wanders aimlessly through the town, instead of taking vigorous measures against the villain. His ultimate fall is due, therefore, not to crime but to weakness, and this weakness is his dreamy, imaginative nature, the idleness and indolence of genius, a sort of *dolce far niente*. Like Waverley, Ruy Blas is rather a creature of imagination than of reason.

This mystic yearning of Ruy Blas is likewise characteristic of romanticism. He is one of those idle dreamers who are often daring enough to gather flowers from Alpine heights or pluck them from the brink of some abrupt declivity or impending precipice. The more insignificant, indefinite, and difficult of attainment the object of their longing desires, the greater the endeavor to obtain it. Their longing is of the blue-flower type, that mysterious something as distant and of as vague a color as the sky itself. Somehow or other they have intimations or catch glimpses of the unattainable objects of their pining, long before they assume definite shape in their mind or appear visible to the naked eye. They are never quite sure as to whether these objects are material or spiritual. They do not know whether they are to be discovered finally in the sky, on the sea, in the desert, or in the solitude of woods or caves. Their minds are so filled with hazy, dim, mysterious aspirations, that they cannot determine whether their ideal happiness or perfect bliss is to be enjoyed in this world or in the world to come.

The desires of these romantic, longing souls are often purposeless, unutterable, and insatiable. As a consequence of this day-dreaming, these seekers after ideal and unattainable happiness become restless, discontented, vacillating, languishing, moody, incapable of action, aimless wanderers, and victims of the *maladie du siècle*. To them that purpose which leads to activity is absurd. To Lucinda, industry and utility are the "angels of death with the flaming swords, who stand in the way of man's return to Paradise." They cannot think of following a calling or adopting a profession. They cannot endure the exertion or the restraint of forming useful purposes or industrious habits. Ne'er-Do-Well is a vagrant idler, who lies under the

trees, playing his zither, or holds some insignificant post obtained under the influence of his lady. Manfred delights in wandering alone in the wilderness or upon the mountain tops, in gazing upon the torrent or the stars, and in listening to the sighing of the Autumn winds. Ruy Blas, who passed his youth in idleness and longing, asked himself the question, "why work?" Such dreamers are often men of genius, not subject to the laws of ordinary men. To them fortune comes as in a night, only to forsake them in as brief a time. They sow the wind and reap the whirlwind. And yet the greatest achievements and discoveries of mankind have been accomplished by men of restless longings and insatiable desires.

The pathway of history and literature is strewn with just such wrecks. Nations and individuals have alike failed to realize completely their highest ambitions, deepest longings, and noblest aspirations. The Hebrews sought the promised land, and the Christians saw visions of the new Jerusalem. The old Greeks were constantly indulging in vague dreams about happy lands out beyond their reach, or of far off golden fleeces. Mediæval peoples explored the seas, trying to find the happy isles, made crusades to redeem and restore the eternal city, went in quest of the Holy Grail, and wandered over land and sea in search of utopias and beautiful paradises. Hamlet was filled with desires and speculations, but was impotent to accomplish his noble purposes. The hero in Klinger's *Sturm und Drang*, who had an "indefinite craving for boundless activity," became a day-laborer, in order to be something. The restless Rousseau, tormented by a thousand aimless and insatiable desires, was thoroughly discontented with himself and his surroundings. The unhappy wandering René, dissatisfied with life and incapable of resolute, definite action, failed to accomplish his most ardent wishes. Many of the heroes of Byron, another restless, discontented spirit, were incapable of forming any definite plan of action or of satisfying any of their passionate yearnings. These romantic heroes, because of their aspirations which remain always indefinite and incompletely fulfilled, have been fitly compared to a Gothic cathedral. Even Tennyson, inspired by the Christian injunction, "Be ye perfect even as your Father in

Heaven is perfect," would have the Unattainable shadowed forth,  
would have man rise step by step to higher things,

scale the mighty stair  
Whose landing place is wrapped about with clouds  
Of glory of Heaven,

ascend the vast altar-stairs

That slope through darkness up to God,

and keep before the mind that

far-off divine event,  
To which the whole creation moves.

On the way, however, to this ultimate perfection and this distant consummation there are necessarily countless wrecks.

JAMES D. BRUNER.

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

## THE SOURCES OF SHELLEY'S "QUEEN MAB."

"Queen Mab" might almost be represented as Shelley's youthful autobiography, for into it he compressed the thoughts and ideals that were struggling in his youthful, overheated brain. Caution was thrown to the winds, and the most radical theories enthusiastically embraced. He wrote exactly as his brain dictated, seeming to fear neither the adverse criticism of the public, nor the further-reaching censorship of the state. A Shelley of nineteen is a creature of impulse and imagination. But it is very doubtful if he meant to formulate a definite system of philosophy or economics. Mr. Felix Rabbe, indeed, hints that a set plan underlies the poem. It is too incoherent and inflammatory, however, to be more than the expression of his despair at existing human misery. It is no more than a wild protest aimed at established government and inspired religion. True to his nature Shelley was a radical among the extremists of his age; a disciple of the new republican school of thought engendered by the French Revolution. Even as a stripling we find him delving into the advanced writings of Holbach, Helvétius, Rousseau, Volney, Laplace, Bacon, Godwin, Newton and Hume. Their liberalism gained an easy convert. He henceforth became an impatient reformer; one of the most impracticable, perhaps, that ever joined the ranks of re-organizers. "Queen Mab" was the medium chosen for the propagation of his early ideas, and for its sources we must search among the works of those who inspired him. It is not a difficult task, for Shelley seldom hesitated to suggest, or even quote, his authority. Oftentimes in his text he does no more than paraphrase the passage that has struck his fancy; a proceeding that argues little for his originality at this date. But in all truth the term "original" must not be employed at all in speaking of the poem. Hardly a page, so far as the thought goes, was his own. His purpose was not to fabricate a new system of life, but to bind the old political tyranny and slavish belief in inspired religion with a chain already forged by stronger hands than his. He drew from all the sourc-

es at his command, giving to the production the best that was in him. Because this was so, we are justified in calling the resultant work the "sum total of his intellectual life up to that date," and in claiming for these sources the interest that must always attach to whatever is instrumental in the development of a great man.

From a metrical standpoint the poem is imitative. Mrs. Shelley in her note states that Southey's "Thalaba" furnished the form for the lighter lyric portions, those employed when the author is not delivering a sermon against the world's injustice. These are the parts that give the poem a structure, and in which Ianthe and the Spirit figure. They are interwoven with the narrative to give a continuity to the whole. Mrs. Shelley's statement is correct, but the metrical scheme itself is peculiar in that it allows great variations in the length of the verses and in the kind of feet employed. Gummere in his "Handbook of Poetics" classes the metre among the miscellaneous examples of classic imitations, while Dowden speaks of it as "irregular, unrhymed verse." Southey himself in his introduction to "Thalaba" says, "The Dramatic Sketches of Dr. Sayers, a volume that no lover of poetry will recollect without pleasure, induced me, when a young versifier, to practice in this rhythm. I felt that while it gave a poet a wider range of expression, it satisfied the ear of the reader." But, perhaps, two parallel passages, one from "Queen Mab," and the other from Southey's poem, will indicate Shelley's indebtedness on this score. Each quotation is from the opening verses.

"Thalaba:"

How beautiful is night!  
A dewy freshness fills the silent air;  
No mist obscures, nor cloud nor speck nor stain  
Breaks the serene of heaven:  
In full-orbed glory yonder moon divine  
Rolls through the dark blue depths.  
Beneath her steady ray  
The desert circle spreads,  
Like the round ocean girded with the sky.  
How beautiful is night!



## "Queen Mab:"

How wonderful is Death:—  
 Death and his brother Sleep!  
 One pale as yonder waning moon,  
 With lips of lurid blue;  
 The other, rosy as the morn,  
 When, throned on ocean's wave,  
 It blushes o'er the world:  
 Yet both so passing wonderful!

Doubtless two passages could be found offering a closer metrical parallel, but these have the advantage of being initial lines, and of offering a striking resemblance in movement and spirit, if not in idea, one to the other. Southey retained the metre throughout his lengthy poem, but Shelley, having employed it entirely for two out of his nine parts, reverted to blank verse in the sermonizing portions. From there on he used the Southey-an metre only, as I have suggested, when *Ianthe* and the Spirit were reintroduced to mould the piece into a coherent unit. This blank verse is usually of the regular iambic pentameter type.

However greatly Shelley may have come under the sway of the men and women of his generation with fanatical cults and "isms," no one influence held him so completely as that exerted by the philosopher and political economist, William Godwin. The reasons for this are not difficult to find. Shelley was young, and of a peculiarly enthusiastic temperament; Godwin was almost sixty, and was counted among the clearest thinkers of his day. One was in the assimilative and formative period; the other had already done his work and won his reputation. Both were of the revolutionary school of thought, each believing in the utter corruption of society and government, and striving for future regeneration. Where the older man had fought his battle against all social institutions, and was as yet revered by liberal reformers, Shelley had his spurs to win. The philosopher, through his writings, offered him a definite and attractive plan of battle; for Godwin was nothing if not clear and logical, even though at times this clearness was a negative virtue in that his logic was founded on false premises. The lucidity of his style was in accord with the precision and formality of his nature.

From this fact alone the presentation of his subject-matter was admirably suited to the young men of his day who demanded simplicity and exactness in preference to deep theoretical deductions. "Throw away your books of Chemistry," said Wordsworth to a young man, "and read Godwin on 'Necessity.'" But it was not alone by the youthful minds that he was worshipped. However extraordinary it may seem to us to-day, during the last decade of the eighteenth and throughout the first ten years of the nineteenth century this man was generally hailed as the foremost philosopher of England. To quote Hazlitt: "Tom Paine was considered a Tom Fool to him; Paley, an old woman; Edmund Burke, a flashy sophist. Truth, moral truth, it was supposed, had taken up its abode, and these were the oracles of thought." Doubtless this is an over-statement, but it certainly contains much truth. He could never have been called the founder of a great philosophic or economic system, for his powers were receptive and analytical, rather than creative and synthetic. He was familiar with Berkeley, Hume, and Locke of the English school, and borrowed largely from the radical French writers, Holbach, Rousseau, and Helvétius. Devoid of humor, he was often led into silly and absurd statements by accepting incorrect premises and arguing sagely along, thereby, to the most ridiculous conclusions. He did not hesitate to express the most destructive and anarchistic beliefs with the solemnity of an Eastern prophet. This trick he had of following his reasoning to extremes lends the whole system to caricature, and one can construct syllogisms from his arguments that lack the essentials of commonsense.

We can, perhaps, estimate Shelley's early reverence for him more accurately, if a portion of the poet's first Godwin letter, of January 3, 1811, be quoted. When he wrote it, he had been familiar with the economist's writings for a period of some two years, and had read them believing that their author was dead. His purpose in corresponding was to enroll himself as a disciple, and to obtain a sympathetic guide. He says in part: "The name of Godwin has been used to create in me feelings of reverence and admiration. I have been accustomed to consider him a luminary too dazzling for the darkness that surrounds him.

From the earliest period of my knowledge of his principles, I have earnestly desired to share on the footing of intimacy that intellect which I have delighted to contemplate in its emanations. Considering, then, these feelings you will not be surprised at the inconceivable emotions with which I learnt your existence and your dwelling. I had enrolled your name in the list of honorable dead. I had felt regret that the glory of your being had passed from this earth of ours. It is not so. You still live, and I firmly believe are planning the welfare of human kind." The two letters that followed on January 10 and 26 are just as impassioned. To Shelley's delight the old gentleman was as friendly as possible, proving that even a "dazzling luminary," to use Shelley's words, could unbend to the heir of a baronetcy and landed estate.

The book that moved Shelley most deeply was the one by which Godwin was especially remembered; I mean the famous "Political Justice." In it the author sets forth the plan of his economic system and moral philosophy. He published it in 1793, and 1809 saw it in Shelley's hands. This was just about the time when the author's fame, unable to bear up under the adverse verdict of posterity, was beginning to decrease. It is necessary to outline the scope and plan for a clearer insight into Shelley's sources. To begin, then, one of the redeeming features, as I have stated before, is the clearness of the structure or framework. Each chapter is divided and subdivided with major and minor headings, while marginal explanatory notes follow the text. At the end of each chapter a resumé sums up its contents. We are never at a loss to catch his meaning. His statements are clear cut, and he is fearless in forcing his reasoning to its logical conclusions. But, à propos of reasoning, he often fails to convince because he holds that the power of reason over mankind is omnipotent where commonsense tells us it is not. From his point of view all that was necessary to convert a sinner was to argue with him, show him the error of his ways, and prove through reason that it would be for his advantage to reform. Result, — a perfect man!

It was one of Godwin's peculiar beliefs that personal freedom, even for the gravest offender against human law, was an inalien-

able right. No man should have the power to hold another in subjection. Hence prisons are all wrong, and like all other social institutions that curtail liberty they should be abolished. Even apart from the justice of incarceration, punishment can only awaken bitterness and a desire for revenge; contrition is never induced by coercion, says Godwin.

The short chapter against marriage sets forth one of his boldest doctrines. The article is so brief and withal so sweeping and revolutionary that it takes one's breath away without giving him time to recatch it before he launches forth with another reform of like nature. There is nothing inflammatory or vehement in the passage: everything is coolly impassioned and logical. Sir Leslie Stephen in his essay on Godwin and Shelley, cleverly and without falling greatly into caricature, summarizes one of these academic theories. He writes: "Three angles of a triangle are as much equal to two right angles in England as in France. Similarly the happiness of an Englishman is just as valuable as the happiness of a Frenchman, and the happiness of a stranger, as the happiness of my relations. Hence—so runs his logic—friendship, gratitude and conjugal felicity are simply mistakes. If my father is a worse man than a stranger, I should rather save the stranger's life than my father's, for I shall be contributing more to human happiness." But, of course, while all this destructive criticism is fair enough from the satirist's viewpoint, it scarcely does Godwin justice. For no man can attain the reputation he won without positive merit. With all these absurdities Godwin was a Republican and a Liberalist and wrote lovingly for the cause he believed in.

Such was the man, then, that Shelley worshipped, who moved him above all others. We can find traces of this influence throughout all his poetry, but it is naturally the strongest in the youthful poem, "*Queen Mab*," of 1813 when the doctrines of his master were vital, living truths to him. Lady Jane Shelley in her "*Shelley Memoirs*" states positively, when speaking of the poet, "that he told me Sir James Mackintosh was intimate with Godwin, to whom, he said, he owed everything: from whose book, '*Political Justice*', he had derived all that was valuable in

knowledge and virtue." In the face of this, however, Mr. A. E. Hancock in "The French Revolution and English Poets," asserts that this influence is not nearly so strong as is commonly supposed, and bases his belief upon the differences in the tone, style, and literary temperament between the men. He refuses to be convinced that the cold, remorseless logic of Godwin could add fuel to Shelley's burning enthusiasm. I think he is wrong, though, in that he overlooks the revolutionary tendencies of "Political Justice." As we have seen, the book is intensely liberal and socialistic, and the style, however emotionless, was better suited to carry conviction than one more fiery and perhaps less logical. Mr. Hancock would give the chief credit of inspiration and source to Volney. But more of this controversy when it becomes necessary to discuss Volney's influence.

Although Sir Leslie Stephen, referring to "Queen Mab," says that "many passages read like the 'Political Justice' done into verse," if we look for specific sources it is by no means certain that we shall discover them. In the notes to the poem Shelley directly quotes three passages from "Political Justice," and two from the same author's "Political Enquirer," as his authorities for parallel ideas in the text of "Queen Mab." These, at least, we are sure of, while it is certain that most of the diatribes against kings, princes, states, institutions, marriages, wars, soldiers and what not, were derived from Godwin's writings. But we cannot place our finger on a definite verse and say: "This is Godwin's idea," or "That is taken from such-and-such a book of 'Political Justice.'" In general we should be justified in describing the third, fourth, fifth and sixth sections as no more than a loose paraphrase of the most striking parts of Godwin's economic writings. For instance, Shelley asks:

Hath Nature's soul . . . on man . . .  
 . . . heaped ruin, vice, and slavery?

His answer is:

Nature! No!  
 Kings, priests, and statesmen blast the human flower  
 Even in its tender bud.



This is the direct burden of much of "Political Justice." Rulers and potentates, by usurping the power that should be equal for all, are menaces to mankind. They could not exist were it not for the government that they have built on the foundation of public ignorance. Each protects the other, while the people support both. Godwin analyzes every known kind of government, and condemns them all. Shelley does the same, but more vaguely; more poetically. The indebtedness, however, is plain.

The notes to "Queen Mab" help greatly in fixing sources, because there the poet is given to citing those passages from "Political Justice" and the "Enquirer" that he had in mind when composing. For example the verses:

These are the hired bravos who defend  
The Tyrant's throne —

are prefixed in the notes to an extract from one of Godwin's Essays, entitled "Trades and Professions." In it we have a bitter denunciation of the soldier's trade. His definition of a warrior shows his attitude clearly, and is spiteful enough to be placed beside Dr. Johnson's famous explanation of the word "oats." "A soldier," he says, "is a man whose business it is to kill those who never offended him, and who are the innocent martyrs of other men's iniquities." Shelley, borrowing his colors from his master, tints his picture with the same hues. Akin to this detestation of the soldier was his horror of war. He writes in Section IV of "Queen Mab":

War is the statesman's game, the priest's delight,  
The lawyer's jest, *the hired assassin's trade.*

Godwin, likewise, in Book II, Chapters xv-xix, cries out against the practice as destructive and unnecessary. But in considering this war question it may be going too far to claim that the poet is following the economist. A man of Shelley's feminine temperament would naturally decry war. We can only say that he seems to oppose fighting for the same reasons as Godwin does.

Of like import is the inflammatory passage beginning:

Man's evil nature, that apology  
 Which kings who rule, and cowards who crouch, set up  
 For their unnumbered crimes, sheds not the blood  
 Which desolates the discord wasted land:  
 From kings, and priests, and statesmen war arose, [etc.]

where again we feel the guiding hand of Godwin.

In another place, after indulging in a tirade against riches, our poet indignantly declares:

And statesmen boast  
 Of wealth!

In his notes he annexes several paragraphs from Godwin's "Enquirer" on the same question. Both men take the ground that an excess of riches is unjust to the less fortunate — Godwin arguing intelligently enough from the point of view of the political economist of the old school; Shelley raving with the incoherence of a youthful agitator. Among other things the former says: "In consequence of our consideration for the precious metals, one man is enabled to heap to himself luxuries at the expense of the necessities of his neighbor; a system admirably fitted to produce all the varieties of disease and crime which men never fail to characterize the two extremes of opulence and poverty." Shelley wrote:

The iron rod of Penury still compels  
 The wretched slave to bend the knee to wealth.

The connotation is the same, but the thought is such a commonplace one that I should not feel justified in suggesting any source at all, had not Shelley transcribed from his master the aforementioned passage. The psychology of Godwin seems also to have impressed Shelley. After repeating several verses in the notes from his text, he refers us to "Political Justice" as one of his two authorities.

It is to Volney, a republican liberalist of the French Revolution, that Shelley was indebted for the structure of "Queen Mab." The Frenchman's *chef d'œuvre*, "*Les Ruines*," is the book on which the Englishman drew. Although to-day we have

forgotten Volney, at the close of the eighteenth century he had wide spread fame as a literary exponent of freedom. Born in 1757, while yet in his minority he made extended travels in Egypt and Palestine. History has it that Napoleon on his Egyptian Campaign, used the guide book Volney had written. Later the States-General elected him a member. In 1791 he published "*Les Ruines, ou Méditations sur les Révolutions des Empires.*" It strikes the note of vehement protest against contemporary institutions and society. It analyzes the governments of the Empires of the past, shows where they failed, and presents us with the moral. It decries war, and sets itself up as the enemy of religion. In a word it was heartily in accord with the revolutionary spirit of its day. We know from Hogg that Shelley was familiar with it before 1813, for he quotes his friend as saying: "Volney's 'Ruins' was one of Harriet's text books, which she used to read aloud for our instruction and edification." Its influence on "Queen Mab" is twofold. Besides taking over almost intact its framework, changing only where additional borrowings were made from Sir William Jones, we know from internal evidence that some of the ideas also found their way into the English poem.

Let me first outline the plan of the French work, and later compare it with that of "Queen Mab." A traveller, ruminating among the ruins of Palmyra upon the transitoriness of human glory, is roused from his meditations by a supernatural Genius who volunteers to satisfy his curiosity. To do this the better, the Genius separates the soul of the Traveller from his body, and bears the former upwards into the heavens. Below them, to celestial eyes — and the Traveller for the time being possesses such — the Orb of Earth is visible with its mountains and rivers, countries and cities. At this point the Genius begins his philosophical discussion of kings, wars, and religions. The artificial framework is held together by dialogues between the two. With Shelley, the Genius becomes Queen Mab; and the traveller, Ianthe. The Genius bears his disciple aloft on his wings; the Fairy Mab transports Ianthe in a "pearly and pellucid car." Ianthe, too, receives the boon of celestial vision. To the Traveller the earth has the appearance of "a disk variegated with

spots." Shelley's creation beholds the more poetic sight of "a vast and shadowy sphere." Queen Mab, like Volney's mouth-piece, discourses upon Emperors, governments and religion. In both works the ruins of Palmyra are first reviewed, followed by Palestine, Egypt and Arabia. With this mass of evidence no reasonable doubt (à propos of Shelley's source) can be entertained.

But the case is different as regards Shelley's borrowing of ideas. The extent of Volney's loan seems to be a mooted question. Mr. Hancock in "The French Revolution and English Poets," together with Herr Kellner, writing in *Englische Studien* for 1895-6, hold that Shelley's debt to Volney is immense; while all other commentators seem satisfied, when they deem the matter worthy of attention, to accept "Political Justice" as his principal inspiration. The latter view appears to me the saner. It is well to remember that Mr. Hancock, in that his thesis is on Shelley and the French Revolution, holds a brief for Volney, and is, in a way, bound to prove his case. Herr Kellner offers no comparison of the relative influences of Godwin and Volney, confines himself to pointing out parallelisms in the texts of "*Les Ruines*" and "Queen Mab." To repeat myself, Hancock's essay claims that Godwin's work and personality were of secondary importance when compared with the Frenchman's. He states his case dogmatically, and leaves it as proved, but for the following reasons, I incline to Godwin.

(I) *With reference to a first draft of "Queen Mab" and its date.*

Shelley makes no mention of Volney in the notes to the poem, nor does he allude to him at all, so far as I can find, in connection with it. On the contrary, he employs five separate quotations from Godwin in conjunction with his text, as if to direct one to the source of the ideas. Mr. Hancock accounts for this by asserting that Volney was used in a first draft of the poem. The data upon which he rests his case is as follows: "Medwin" in his life of Shelley, "states that 'Queen Mab' was begun towards the close of 1809, and that soon after the expulsion from Oxford it was converted from a mere imaginative poem, into a systematic attack upon the institutions of society." To follow

him farther, it seems that in 1811, a certain Finnerty, an Irishman, was imprisoned for his too liberal views. A subscription was taken up for him to which Shelley contributed a guinea. A Dublin newspaper at that time stated that the "profits of a very beautiful poem had been remitted by Shelley to maintain the patriotic Finnerty while in prison." "The poem," says Mr. Hancock, "Prof. Dowden conjectures, was the 'Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things,' a poem now lost. It was very probably the first draft of 'Queen Mab,' based on Volney, referred to by Medwin, and published in 1811. This theory is further substantiated by Shelley himself. Later in life he was before the Lord Chancellor in a suit for the possession of his child. In the count against him he was declared 'an avowed atheist who had written and published a certain work called 'Queen Mab,' with Notes, wherein he blasphemously derided the truths of Christian Revelation, and denied the existence of God as the creator of the Universe.' Shelley pleaded extreme youth as the excuse, and declared it was written at nineteen, therefore, in 1811. But the present form certainly was not written until 1813. Shelley, therefore, must have referred to the first draft, based on Volney and attacking religion."

I beg pardon for the length of this quotation, but there are several interesting points about it. In the first place nobody is certain that a lost, first draft was ever written. At any rate nobody of the present day has ever seen a copy of this, or of the "Essay on the Existing State of Things." Again the fact that Medwin claims 1809 as the date of the beginning is by no means conclusive, as he was a notoriously inexact biographer. Dowden says of this "Poetical Essay" that it might possibly have been "a satire dealing with the conditions of Finnerty's unhappy country during the rebellion of 1789, and since the act of the Union." He also writes of it, as Mr. Hancock states, "It occurs to me as a conjecture not wholly groundless, that the 'Political Essay' may have been an earlier form of those sections of 'Queen Mab' which treat of the present time, etc." At best, Prof. Dowden admittedly knows little about the matter. Further, with regard to Shelley's statement before the court, that he was only nineteen when



he wrote the poem, it may be taken *cum grano salis*. We have only to remember that Shelley's memory, like Poe's, was extremely treacherous where autobiographical dates were concerned. Here, too, it was to his distinct advantage to plead youthfulness. But, even if the fact of a first draft were established, would the assurance be a material gain for Volney? It would, I think, simply admit the possibility of a deeper debt to "*Les Ruines*" than the 1813 edition acknowledges. But, upon second thoughts, why should it? We are not even certain that Volney was known to Shelley at that time. "Political Justice," however, was acquired by him in 1809. So why should not the first draft, as well as the second, be founded on Godwin?

(II) *Godwin's style versus Volney's.*

I mentioned this point when discussing Godwin and there is really little more that I can say. Mr. Hancock writes in this connection, after quoting one of Shelley's passionate letters to Godwin: "There can be no doubt that Shelley, at an early date, was influenced by Godwin's book, and strongly so. There is something strange about this. For Shelley, as Matthew Arnold points out, was highly inflammable; his blood often rose to the boiling point from indignation. . . . Godwin by temperament was just the opposite. If anything is characteristic of 'Political Justice' it is cold blooded, calculating caution. . . . The disparity in tone between the book and the poem is so marked that it demands demonstration before concluding the first to be the source and inspiration of the second." I really do not see what safer course we can follow than to accept Shelley's own word, strengthened, if possible, by the statements of his biographers, as to whether or not the "cold blooded, calculating caution" of Godwin's work aroused his enthusiasm. His first hand testimony, which I have quoted elsewhere, surely seems to acknowledge it. This is not saying that if "Political Justice" had been written in the romantic, passionate style of "*Les Ruines*," Shelley would not have been the more influenced by it. We do not know as to that. Nor is it saying that he was not inspired by the theories and ideas of Volney. We know that he was. But the question is one of comparative influences.

(III) *The internal evidence of subject matter.*

The subject matter of "Political Justice" is not unlike that of "*Les Ruines*." Each bitterly assails kings, priests, and social institutions, subjecting them to a rhetorical bombardment, and each is dissatisfied with the present for identical causes. But Godwin is more formal and pretentious than Volney. He delves into the regions of psychology, and attempts to establish a definite economic system. The French work is more emotional and popular, resorting on occasions to dialectics. Where Godwin lays his emphasis on attaining the abolition of government, and allied institutions, Volney devotes over half his work to arguing away inspired religion. To the best of my knowledge, outside of the question of framework, only one passage offers itself from which Shelley obviously borrowed for his poem. I shall transcribe it:

"Do you see those fires which spread over the earth, and are you acquainted with their causes and effects?" "Oh, Genius," I replied, "I see columns of flame and smoke, and, as it were, insects that accompany them; but discerning with difficulty as I do, the masses of towns and monuments, how can I distinguish such petty creatures? I can see nothing more than that these insects seem to carry on a sort of mock battle, they advance, they approach, they attack, they pursue." "It is mockery," said the Genius. "It is the thing itself." "And what name," replied I, "shall we give to these foolish animalcules that destroy each other? Do they live only a day, and is this short life further abridged by violence and murder?" The Genius then once more touched my eyes and my ears. "Listen," said he to me, "and observe." Immediately, turning my eyes in the same direction, "Alas," said I, transpierced with anguish, "these columns of flame ascend from towns and villages set on fire. I see the horsemen that light them. I see them sword in hand overrun the country."—*Les Ruines*, Chap. 12. [From a translation.]

Shelley, "Queen Mab," Sec. IV, 33:

Ah! whence yon glare  
That fires the arch of heaven? That dark red smoke  
Blotting the silver moon? The stars are quenched  
In darkness, and the fire and slaughter  
Gleam faintly through the gloom that gathers round, [etc.]

In both these passages the beholders of the battle are looking down on it from the heavens.

An anonymous author of 1821, writing a pamphlet of some seventy pages entitled "A reply to the Antimatrimonial Hypothesis and Supposed Atheism of Percy Bysshe Shelley, as Laid

down in 'Queen Mab,' " makes the statement that Pope's "Messiah" seems to have inspired much of Shelley's glowing picture of the future perfect age. An examination of Pope's poem indicates that the point is well taken, though, of course, the subject matter which is avowedly in imitation of the fourth Eclogue of Virgil, was common literary property throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. But the "Messiah" would have offered Shelley the readiest source, and a comparison of the two really seems to establish Shelley's indebtedness. Whatever similarity there is, however, must be confined to the eighth and ninth sections of "Queen Mab" which the author devotes to painting the earthly paradise of that coming time when man shall have become metamorphosed into a human angel, if you will allow me the expression. The parallelism is twofold. On the one hand each poet sees a change for the better in the physical world itself; on the other, both foretell perfection in the nature of man. Imaging the coming glory, Shelley has it:

Health floats amid the gentle atmosphere,  
Glow in the fruits, and mantles on the stream,  
No storms deform the beaming brow of heaven  
Nor scatter in the freshness of its pride  
The foliage of the ever-verdant trees;  
But fruits are ever ripe, flowers ever fair.

Pope's imitative Pastoral puts it:

The swain in barren desert with surprise  
Sees lilies spring, and sudden verdure rise;  
And start amid the thirsty wilds, to hear  
New falls of water murmuring in his ear.

We see that even the laws of Nature are to be thrust aside in this poetical millenium, and fact and reality to have no place in Nature's blessed regeneration. But after all each is entitled to his visions, and sometimes castles in Spain are built by wise men. It must be borne in mind, of course, that when Pope is merely following his models, Shelley is in sober earnest.

There are one or two passages where the parallelism passes from the general to the specific, and we are tempted to assert that Shelley had Pope directly in mind.

From the "Messiah:"

The lambs and wolves shall graze the verdant mead,  
And boys in flowery bands the tiger lead;  
The steer and lion at one crib shall meet,  
And harmless serpents lick the pilgrim's feet.

From "Queen Mab:"

The lion now forgets to thirst for blood;  
There might you see him sporting in the sun  
Beside the dreadless kid; his claws are sheathed,  
His teeth are harmless, custom's force has made  
His nature as the nature of a lamb.

Of still closer resemblance, perhaps:

The "Messiah:"

The smiling infant in his hand shall take  
The crested basilisk and speckled snake,  
Pleased the green lustre of the scales survey,  
And with their forked tongues shall innocently play.

"Queen Mab:"

. . . . . Smiles  
To see a babe before his mother's door  
Sharing his morning's meal  
With the green and golden basilisk  
That comes to lick his feet.

Mr. E. Koepfel in a German article published in *Englische Studien* for 1900, calls attention to the fact that Shelley among his other numerous borrowings in "Queen Mab," made an unquestionable use of Sir William Jones's Oriental tale, the "Palace of Fortune." The debt is not a heavy one. Sir William (1746-94) was one of those numerous authors whose fame, rising to the heights during his life, failed to outlive the following generation. He left us no popular literary monument, and his reputation rests on his Oriental scholarship (he was the first Englishman to master Sanskrit) and on a small volume of poems, issued 1772. These were partly adapted and partly translated from the Asiatic languages. Among them is the "Palace of Fortune." The story, for it is a narrative tale, very briefly is as follows: Maia, a maiden of dazzling beauty, upon discovering

her perfection, grows discontented with her hum-drum life. The Queen of the heavens appears, and the girl is borne to the Goddess' palace in the skies. There the folly of discontent is taught her through a series of visions. From here to the end we are interested in Maia's adventures as a girl, and are happy to learn eventually that she repents her discontent.

One sees immediately that the purpose and subject matter of Shelley's poem, and those of the Eastern narrative have little in common. The only resemblance lies on the side of the plan or framework. In each we find a lovely slumbering maiden driven in a heavenly car to the regions of a powerful goddess of the heavens who is her guide. But as with Pope's "Messiah" it would be an error to claim that Shelley borrowed an idea that was original in the source he adopted. We know from Sir William's own words that he drew from the East. For he writes: "The hint of the 'Palace of Fortune' was taken from an Indian tale, translated a few years ago from the Persian by a very ingenious gentleman in the service of the India-Company; but I have added several descriptions, and episodes from Eastern writers . . . etc." This proves that the ground work of the story was of ancient origin. Mr. Koeppel points out further that Chaucer's "Hous of Fame," later adapted by Pope in his "Temple of Fame," has a description of a maiden viewing Mother Earth from a heavenly vantage ground. Rossetti's "Blessed Damozel" also has a similarly suggestive stanza. Were it not for internal evidence, we might hesitate before becoming dogmatic. In short, Shelley went to the "Palace of Fortune" for his Fairy Mab, instead of drawing on Volney, from whom, as we have seen, he took the general outline of his plan. Influenced by Jones again he substitutes a girl for the stern Traveller of "*Les Ruines*." By doing so he gives a lighter, lyric touch to his framework.

The Ahasuerus fragment found in the beginning of Section VII is a loose translation or adaptation from Christian Schubart's one hundred and twenty line poem "*Der Ewige Jude*." Shelley, in one of the "Queen Mab" notes, translates all but the last eight lines, which did not suit his purpose, and remarks: "This fragment is the translation of part of some German work, whose



title I have vainly endeavored to discover. I picked it up, dirty and torn, some years ago in Lincoln's Inn Fields." The mystery of the ultimate authorship was solved by "Joannes" in a letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette* for December, 1866. Shelley's translation, as has since been shown by C. R. S. in the second series, Volume V of *Notes and Queries*, was probably taken from a German Magazine called the *Museum*, among whose pages for the year 1802 appears a portion of Schubart's rhapsody. In all likelihood a battered copy of this magazine is the "fragment" to which Shelley refers. In his translation from the German, the poet did not hesitate in two separate places to interpolate freely. When it came to making use of this rendition in the text of "Queen Mab," he merely interwove a portion of the story, placing it, very logically, in his diatribe against inspired religion. I say very logically, because he could scarcely have found a better mouthpiece for his bitter religious denunciation than this same Ahasuerus, the Wandering Jew, whom God had doomed to everlasting torment. But only in a passage of a dozen lines does he deal directly with the legend, and tell of the wanderer's eternal punishment, although, as a character of the poem whose purpose is to defame the creator, he is present throughout the entire seventh section. When referring to the legend it is merely in such general terms as anyone, slightly familiar with it, might employ.

Shelley's religious views were more radical, if possible, than his economic and social opinions. Having rejected the divinity of Christ, and the revealed religion of the Bible, he became a confirmed atheist. Nor are we to lay his skepticism to an ignorance of the subject. Lady Jane Shelley in her life of the poet states that he had read the Bible four times before he was twenty. Although this may be assigning too much to her kinsman's industry, it is proof enough that he was familiar with the book's teachings. His disbelief in church and state was certainly inherent in him. He was constitutionally incapable of thinking along established lines. As an omnivorous and receptive reader, he was able very early to crystallize his theories by devouring the works of kindred, congenial philosophers. Like his economical system, his irreligious principles were partly the result of

such a process. For a young man — Shelley was nineteen when "Queen Mab" was written — his religious readings were thorough and diverse. We know from his letters and notes to the poem that he had absorbed the ideas of Holbach, Volney, Godwin, Lucretius, Pliny, Bacon and Rousseau. His type of mind would naturally gravitate to the most sweepingly destructive of them all. He did not even think by halves, and when we find him continually citing Holbach's *Système de la Nature*, we may rest assured that the book stands for the culmination of the most scathing attacks on the contemporary condition of religion. At any rate such is the case. In it, under the assumed name of Miraband, the author summed up the bold doubts that had been troubling France for half a century. He did it so openly and unreservedly, forcing the pre-revolutionary tendency to skepticism to its uttermost issue, that he terrified those who had joined in the controversy. The book caused the furor that might have been expected. Louis XVI and his advisers were exasperated because the unknown author argued against the divine right of kings as well as religion. And naturally the Church was bitterly resentful. Diderot, who was suspected of the authorship, found it expedient to leave Paris until his innocence was proved. Such was the character of the book that Shelley found so helpful. Our knowledge of him aids us in determining how helpful. Possibly the best way of deciding this relationship, while at the same time outlining the scope of Holbach's volume, would be to set down the former's imitative verses, together with his own quotations from "The System of Nature."

The first of these is from Section VI of "Queen Mab." It reads:

No atom of this turbulence fulfills  
A vague and unnecessitated task,  
Or acts but as it must or ought to act.  
Necessity, thou mother of the world!

These lines strike the keynote of much of the message of "Queen Mab." Shelley, following his teachers, was a confirmed Necessarian. He held the belief that Nature is immutable; that her laws cannot be changed. No atom ever escapes her absolute

control. Every molecule has its reason for the slightest variation in condition. All is cause and effect, and nothing could be otherwise than it is. Nature is supreme for she rules the Universe. This philosophy, of course, is not new. Materialism can be traced from the ancient Greeks, through the Romans, Pliny and Lucretius, and down to our present day. But its doctrines were never expressed more uncompromisingly than by Holbach. He infused this dogmatism into his disciple. The last quotation on "Necessity etc.," taken directly from Holbach, is enlarged at great length by the poet. It introduces a new element, Fatalism. This is practically a synonym for necessity, but involves the consideration of Nature's unvarying law in its relation to man. Shelley is here drawing directly from the Frenchman, merely paraphrasing his thought. He will have it that every human action is preordained. Life itself has been mapped out by Nature, and, as we know, no such word as "deviation" occurs in her dictionary. This hopeless doctrine, if followed up closely, will destroy all belief in a Supreme Being. For where Nature is all powerful, unless God can be connected with her, a Deity is out of place. Neither Shelley nor Holbach makes any attempt to save this conception of a creative being, and a few verses further on we find our young atheist bleating forth: "There is no God." Many Shelley sympathizers have tried to explain away these four words, but it seems to me that they denote one thing. No meaning could be plainer or more final. Shelley in his note declares that the statement has to do only with a "Creative Deity," or, in other words, with the pulpit conception of God. We cannot deny some form of worship to him. He admits that "the hypothesis of a pervading spirit co-eternal with the universe, remains unshaken." He worshipped, it seems, a vague spirit of Nature, more difficult of definition, even than most religious terms because he does not seem quite certain of it himself. Be that as it may, Holbach holds the same views, and it is through his arguments that Shelley attempts to convince his readers. The "System of Nature" also denies a future life of any kind, and scoffs at the idea of a hell. Shelley does not, in "Queen Mab," at least, touch upon either of the questions. Nor does he, apparently, draw very largely upon

Holbach's denunciation of kings and kingdoms found in the same book, to furnish him arguments for "Queen Mab."

In the same note he drags in Lord Bacon and Pliny to strengthen his position further. His reading along the lines that interested him led him to them. Since he borrows from them to substantiate his atheistic assertions, their works must be numbered among his sources. He quotes from a passage in the "Moral Essays" where "Lord Bacon says that atheism leaves to a man reason, philosophy, natural piety, laws, reputation, and everything that can serve to conduct him to virtue" From Pliny's "Natural History" too, he transcribes a paragraph; one in which the old Roman professes his atheism. Not unlike Shelley, he charged the government of the world to Nature, not to God. But both Pliny and Lord Bacon are among the minor factors in influencing "Queen Mab."

Among the more important of the minor religious influences, that of Lucretius should be noted. Shelley makes two distinct references to him in the notes, proving that he at least had him in mind about the time "Queen Mab" was written. But at this point I should like to say with regard to these minor citations that Shelley may have searched through his favorite authors for parallel passages after his own poem had been finished. The notes were all added after the completion of the poem, of course. We have really no right to assume that these appended passages are the sources of his text. All that we can be reasonably certain about is that Shelley knew the principles and theories of those he quoted, and later used them to bear out his own theories. This view, however, does not detract from the value of the quotations as determinants of sources. It is but reasonable to suppose that those authors were used who appealed most strongly to him, and who, if they did not originally lead his mind into the turbulent thought-channels ventured upon in "Queen Mab," at least guided his reason through them. It would be folly to declare that he copied from his less favorite writers. The alternative directs us to those who influenced him strongly and this is all that a source hunter desires.

But to return to Lucretius. The first reference in the notes

is this, placed under Shelley's verse: "The mob of peasants, nobles, and kings." It runs:

'Tis sweet from land, when seas are raging wild,  
To see another struggling on the deep:  
Not that 'tis sweet his torment to behold,  
But sweet to look on ills, ourselves secure;  
'Tis sweet to see opposing fronts in war  
Arrayed in fields, their dangers all unshared;  
But sweeter far to mount to learning's heights, [etc.]

(I use the translation of C. F. Johnson. The passage is taken from the opening lines of Book II.)

Just why Shelley stuck this quotation in at this point I am at a loss to understand. There is not the slightest connection between the two, certainly. The context of the first has to do with the lust of nobles, kings, etc. for gold; the second, with the pleasures of security and mental superiority. Nor is any of this book of Lucretius, dealing, as it does, with the properties of atoms for the most part, applicable to Shelley's line.

The second citation from the Latin poet is shorter. It is added to Shelley's:

Or religion  
Drives his wife raving mad.

(It is from Book II line about 80. My own translation.)

Often men have sold their country and beloved parents to escape the Acherusian courts [meaning death].

Here by stretching the imagination we can discover a slight parallelism in thought. But doubtless Shelley had in mind the thought of the Third Book as a whole, rather than any one passage. In it Lucretius voices his materialism by attempting to prove that the soul dies with the body. His seeds of skepticism fell on fertile soil when planted in Shelley's mind. But with Lucretius, if anywhere, I should hesitate before claiming a more than general influence on "Queen Mab." For the latter does not touch upon the after life at all, but tries to argue away revealed religion and a traditional God.

Besides Holbach and Lucretius, Godwin and Volney probably influenced the religious attitude of "Queen Mab," although



Shelley makes no mention of them in this connection. Chapters ii, iii, iv, Bk. VI, of "Political Justice" define Godwin's views on religion. He declared that religious establishments tended to make a man think according to rule, and that this was slavish. Reason should decide a man's belief. But with his well known caution on questions that might brew trouble for him, he does not force the issue. Volney in the latter half of "*Les Ruines*," ventures to court-martial all the well known forms of religious worship. After trying each creed he finds it useless and recommends the use of reason. Since Shelley was so familiar with these two books before writing his poem, it is fair to assume that they served to cement his radical views together. But here again the influence is general.

While we can hardly say that the Bible influenced Shelley at all in "Queen Mab," we do know that he drew upon it for two passages. The more important of these is the brief paraphrase of a few verses from Ecclesiastes, Chapter I.

Shelley has:

Thus do the generations of the earth  
Go to the grave and issue from the womb,  
Surviving still the imperishable change  
That renovates the world.

As he points out in the notes the original is:

One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth forever. The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose, [etc.]

The other is merely a line from Canto 7, running:

Many are called, but few I will select.

There is but one other reference to a Biblical passage. I mean the verses on the story of the Savior. Beyond these parallels, if we exclude a single mention of "Eden" and the occurrence of the name of the Biblical Moses, we must seek elsewhere for sources.

Shelley's attitude in "Queen Mab" towards matrimony is on a par with his religious ideas. In a word this young gentleman would in theory have none of marriage. The perfect union, if

we are to credit his assertions, can last only so long as mutual love endures. When one party becomes weary of the arrangement no law should compel him or her, as it happens, to endure the caresses of the other. Everything in this world of ours will go wrong until perfect freedom of mind and body are attained. The marriage law is an affront to personal liberty, and the state has no right to bind a man and woman together when happiness is no longer possible. These startling propositions were adduced in his notes as a comment upon the passage from the text of the poem:

Even love is sold. The solace of all woe  
Is turned to deadliest agony: old age  
Shivers in selfish beauty's loathing arms, [etc.]

It is probable that Shelley always entertained these views, even from boyhood. But they assumed definite form from familiarity with the writings of two men: Godwin on the one hand, and a James Henry Lawrence on the other. Perhaps, in this case, the former's influence was the less important. At any rate we are uncertain how great it is, for Shelley nowhere acknowledges the extent of his debt. Shelley's ideas on the subject are the same as Godwin's, and his thorough acquaintance with "Political Justice" in which the matter is discussed, is beyond question. We may thus claim it as a probable source of the love passage in "Queen Mab" with a clear conscience. The tone of the philosophic article is, as usual, frigid and logical. It may be found in the appendix to the second volume. Its arguments are closely akin to Shelley's.

We are more certain in regard to Shelley's relation to Lawrence, for we have a definite written statement of his obligation. It was through the former's audacious "Empire of the Nairs," a novel, and his poem, "Love, an Allegory" that the young poet knew him. This romance was published in England in 1811, just before "Queen Mab" was written. The former professes to be a record of the matrimonial relations of the Nairs, a people of India. I have been unable to examine a copy, but know that the argument was directly opposed to marriage. A system of free love through elective affinities was substituted. The poem "Love" was on the same plan. It was published once in

England, and then proscribed. We can see how deeply Lawrence impressed Shelley by the epistle the latter wrote him on August 17, 1812.:

Sir: I feel peculiar satisfaction is seizing the opportunity, which your politeness places in my power, of expressing to you personally (as I may say), a high acknowledgement of my sense of your talents and principles, which, before I conceived it possible that I should ever know you, I sincerely entertained. Your "Empire of the Nairs," which I read this spring, succeeded in making me a perfect convert to its doctrines. I then retained no doubts of the evils of marriage — Mrs. Wollstonecraft reasons too well for that; but I had been dull enough not to perceive the greatest argument against it until developed in the "Nairs,"—viz., prostitution both legal and illegal. I am a young man not yet of age, and have now been married a year to a woman younger than myself. Love seems inclined to stay in prison. . . .

Provided Shelley was sincere, which we have no reason to doubt, the letter speaks for itself.

It really seems as if Shelley had introduced into "Queen Mab" every revolutionary theory and irrational idea that possessed him at the time of writing. He even insisted that vegetarianism would be a necessary condition of the earthly paradise that is to follow present misery. At the time he was himself an enthusiastic vegetarian. He had not been long a convert, nor was he to remain one. At this period he was an ardent disciple because personally influenced by Mr. Newton, author of "Defence of a Vegetarian Regimen," and by Dr. Lambe, another well known exponent of the cult, and author of numerous treatises on the value of pure water. I am sorry to say that I have been unable to secure their works, but Shelley has explained the principles in his "Vindication of a Natural Diet," printed first in the notes of the poem, and later as a separate pamphlet. But the tenets of the vegetarian creed are really too well known to require exposition here. As for Shelley he could never have been considered a crank on the subject, so far as personally refraining from meat goes. The passage in "Queen Mab" shows how serious he considered the matter for society. He, himself, was always exceedingly simple and temperate in his diet, and if at times he indulged in flesh, it was because he preferred to eat what was put before him rather than inconvenience anybody.

Finally, a few words as to the stylistic and textual influences.

"Queen Mab," says Mr. H. S. Salt, "shows traces not only of Southey, but of Pope, Gray, Collins, Akenside, and Thomson." Lady Jane Shelley, too, admits that "Queen Mab" sometimes betrays adherence to that conventional style of poetry that was passing away." She refers, undoubtedly, to the school of Pope. But I do not find this eighteenth century element remarkably strong. The poem contains some twenty-eight hundred lines, and after a fairly careful search, I find that virtually only the following lines have the true conventional swing:

Celestial coursers paw the unyielding air,  
And stop obedient to the reins of light.  
  
And leaning graceful from the ethereal car  
The lovely silence of the unfathomed main  
Strengthens in health and poisons in disease.  
Flows in the fruit and mantles on the streams  
Shrank with the plants, and darkened with the night.  
Peace cheers the mind, health renovates the frame  
All kindly passions, and all pure desires  
That mocked his fury, and prepared his fall.  
That grace the proud and noisy pomp of wealth  
First crime, triumphant, o'er all hope careered.

With many of these lines an ear trained in eighteenth century poetry would await the completion of an heroic couplet. In the first examples the slurring of the "e" before an initial vowel links those lines with traditional classic verses. In the later lines the balanced construction serves the same purpose. With the consecutive verses:

These tools the tyrant tempers to his work  
Wields in his wrath, and as he wills destroys—

we find labored alliteration highly developed, an artificial device that began to die out with the development of the romantic movement. On the whole the blank verse of "Queen Mab" is hardly distinctive of any school. It has many of the ear marks of clas-

sic phrasing, and leans at times towards the Thomsonian style of blank verse, which itself looks backwards towards the school of Pope. Shelley's subject-matter compels him to be declamatory. The numerous invectives and arraignments of kings and rulers force from him many exclamations. The result is a hectic, florid style definitely related to nothing, and whose youthful iterations become very monotonous.

Once in every few pages a slightly Miltonic touch is felt, more from the stern nature of the subject, I fancy, than from Shelley's devotion to "Paradise Lost."

The following is to me faintly suggestive of Milton:

Whilst suns their mingling beamings darted  
Through clouds of circumambient atmosphere,  
And pearly battlements looked  
On the immense of Heaven.

Perhaps there is, too, a parallelism between Shelley's stanza on peace and sleep and Shakespeare's on the same, in Scene I, Act III, second Part of "Henry IV."

There are three or four minor verbal borrowings that I have found. For instance, Shelley twice in his works uses the seventeenth century word "withal." One of these instances occurs in "Queen Mab" in the verse:

Such as the nurses frighten babes withal.

The word does not belong to the eighteenth century, Pope not using it at all. Shakespeare employs it twenty times, seventeen at the end of the clause, as here. Milton uses it four times, but always in the middle of the sentence. Shelley's other instance finds "withal" likewise at the end of the clause.

The word "horrent" I have no doubt he took from Milton. Shakespeare, Pope and Tennyson do not use it at all. In "Queen Mab" Shelley has "horrent shrieks" meaning "terrifying or penetrating shrieks." But in "Hellas" he uses "horrent arms," an unusual expression taken directly from "Paradise Lost."

From Gray's "Elegy," he borrowed one phrase, "stubborn glebe."



"Queen Mab" has:

To them compels the *stubborn glebe* to yield.

Gray wrote:

Their furrow oft the *stubborn glebe* has broke.

From Coleridge's "Kubla Khan" he likewise took the phrase, "mazy motion."

Besides these a few phrases suggest Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," but in spirit rather than in exact phrasing.

Once peace and freedom blest  
The cultivated plain.

and Fearless and free the ruddy children played.  
That grace the proud and noisy pomp of wealth.

JOHN WARNER TAYLOR.

Columbia University, New York City.

## THE BIOGRAPHY OF SIDNEY LANIER<sup>1</sup>

There was hardly any question that a biography of Sidney Lanier would be admitted to the American Men of Letters series. Of the so-called "Southern" writers Poe was a national, even a cosmopolitan, figure; but Simms and Lanier were admitted perhaps as much for being types and representatives of definite periods as for their innate worth. The opportunity of Professor Trent's "Simms" lay just here; and whatever opinions may be held as to it, it became really a study of Southern conditions and culture and thought in the generation preceding the Civil War. In Sidney Lanier's case, the opportunity was even greater — it was to make a biography of Lanier the study of the conditions existing and fermenting after war, the gathering together of forces which lay scattered and despoiled and inert, their conservation and development into the strength of a New South, itself tortuously working with new problems into the realization of a coming to-morrow. In Lanier's own life and generation this realization was not to be achieved — it could only be dreamed of. Its spirit could be siezed and transmitted only by a stronger generation born after war, brought up on a changed soil under different conditions; and the end is not even yet.

Lanier's failure of physical health was seemingly due to the exhaustions and privations of war time and the terrific gloom that followed. Sixteen years after the close of the war his life ebbed away. And it is easy to see that his failure in education, in work, in art, in achievement — the instinctive struggle to get away from the central South, and even beyond its borders, to create richer opportunities and live a fuller life, was due to the same exhausting causes. No great scholar and artist could possibly have arisen under these circumstances — graduating from a remote and unknown Southern college in 1860, immediately swept into the mad vortex of war, and then plunged into worse than war — darkness and utter stagnation of life and mind, to be

---

<sup>1</sup> SIDNEY LANIER. By Edwin Mims. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1905. \$1.50 net.

relieved only by social revolution, violence, and tardy recuperation. The example is one of intense effort and will power asserted against circumstance — the fell circumstance of disease — by the poet and by the community and state. Worn with the personal struggle, but prefiguring by his ideals the rejuvenescence and the re-creation to follow, the poet succumbed in 1881: the state and a younger citizenship still continue the intense struggle which may take still further generations to bring into the perfect day. Some picture like this seems true of the setting and the life and the position of Sidney Lanier.

Turning to the book in hand, how is the work conceived and how accomplished? Let us hasten to say cordially that Professor Mims shows himself a most painstaking and conscientious biographer. The work is faithfully, perhaps even laboriously, done. All the material obtainable from Lanier's family and from friends, as well as from Lanier's writings, has been carefully gone over and many extracts culled. The biography is extremely accurate. The modern method of annotation and reference to an immediate authority is used and in no way abused. Letters are freely quoted — in the latter portion, too frequently, we think, in full, where the heart of them could be better presented by a short quotation or a paragraph. It is disturbing to see dates and headlines and introductory and irrelevant matter in a continuous literary presentation; and this fault is seen in only one instance in the first part of the book, which is more carefully done and more strongly mastered. But the larger study of the poet's life and the deeper significance of the forces at work in this tremendous period which in so many ways hedged about and restricted the poet's career and yet curiously gave him his liberty to sing even out of its very bitterness and chequered gladness; the thoroughgoing grasp and the philosophic treatment of contemporary life, not only Southern, but American, which may not be wholly left out of sight — social, economic, educational, cultural, artistic, literary — are wanting. The early portions of the book, chapters one to five, are the most attractive. The early life, the right subordination of war themes — Lanier was not noted as a soldier — the new beginnings, wherever there is the personal portrayal, are well done. But when this is over,

when Lanier has had his two graduations—from college and from arms, and when should come the struggle, the work, the achievement, the climax—the material wearies, the style flags, the interest is not compelling, the presentation not convincing.

Just why this should be, why the final impression should be one of depression, instead of a fixed spiritual exaltation, in tracing the aspiration and struggles of Lanier's life, is at first not a little puzzling. We believe one reason is to be found in the Introduction of eight pages, which was probably written last and certainly should have been put last as a final summing up, and by all means should be read last in order not to be robbed of the best pleasure the volume affords, the relative enthusiasm and charm of the earlier chapters. Coming so early, the second paragraph of this Introduction acts as a wet blanket thrown in the face. "It cannot be said, however, that Lanier's rank as a poet . . . is yet fixed. He is a very uneven writer and his defects are glaring. Some of the best American critics—men who have a right to speak with authority—shake their heads in disapproval at what they call the Lanier cult." Etc., etc., etc. And this on page 2 of the book! Some may find this piquant and stimulative of curiosity. But confronted with this assurance emphasized at the outset through several paragraphs, there will also be some readers who will not have the hardihood to plunge into 370 pages farther, unless relieved by counter attractions; and some authors could not have written farther. Without objecting necessarily to a single word in the judgment expressed, it is nevertheless a structural mistake to present the dolefullest face to the audience at the outset. Put towards the end, after sufficient entertainment, the audience is both in a more gracious humor to receive it and in a better position to pass an opinion of its own.

Compare this with the publishers' reason for including Lanier in the series as advertised in their announcement: "the man who is fast coming into full recognition as one of the finest and truest of American poets." It is here immaterial as to which view is the right one: Professor Mims is a conscientious worker and the publishers are book producers of large experience. The real cause of the unsatisfactoriness to the reader is that the author hasn't convinced himself and is only half-hearted as to

his subject, however painstaking in pursuing it; and the result, perhaps unconsciously, is always a half apologetic one. The author is distinctly at his best in destructive criticism; constructively he fails either to interest or to convince. He will not defend Lanier as a whole, where, perhaps, Lanier is most defensible; for the nobility of Lanier's life, the sincerity of the struggle, the lofty ideals Lanier held before himself in every achievement, atone in counter-attractiveness for many obvious defects; but the author does defend Lanier repeatedly in minor details, which are really trivial and unimportant in their bearing. The author has kept his eye perhaps too closely upon "the men who have a right to speak with authority" and not so unreservedly on the higher possibilities of his subject.

Professor Mims is obviously afraid of enthusiasms. But why should he also shun so far all sparkle, humor, grace and charm? It is his merit that he is sane, cautious, deliberate; but these qualities, too, have their defects. The portrait grows singularly objective, and in its final appeal never glows with interior warmth as do the pictures, with singular unanimity, of all who knew Lanier and loved him. Here was life, work, tragedy — why can it not ring out? Here were great phases of the life and the culture of the era — in the opportunity and scope of chapters on the Johns Hopkins University and the New South — why are they not fully seized? The discussion of the "two types" and the "four Georgians," while cases in point, are far too restricted. It argues some deficiency both of knowledge and of sympathy with other parts of the country and phases of its life.

The relative interest in the biographical data and the setting is not increased as we proceed, as must have been the actual succession in the years of Lanier's life — for the last five or six were momentous years! — the interest decreases. A tragedy in effect needs dramatic insight in approaching its catastrophe and getting at its full meaning. The style of the later chapters shows less infusing spirit and the matter is more put together. The change in freedom and subtlety from Lanier's own words freely quoted — their sparkle and literary tonic quality — to the words of his biographer becomes too marked: Lanier's letters are the



most human and intimate part of him. Worn expressions and repetitions on different pages are apparent: "accessible to ideas," "passages that men will not willingly let die," "beautiful tributes," "another good one," "he says . . . he says," etc.

In the final estimate in the chapter on "Criticism and Poetry," which has some of Professor Mims's best work, Lanier is compared, and to his great disparagement, only with Lowell; and the same comparison has already been made more than once before. "It may be claimed without dispute that he was a rare good letter-writer; perhaps only Lowell's letters are more interesting." "He knew but little of the classics beyond what he studied in college; while he read French and German literature to some extent, he did not go into them as Lowell did." (pp. 344, 345). Why always Lowell — himself not a poet of the first distinction? The two were entirely dissimilar in temperament, in education, in travel, in opportunity. Perhaps the author intends to compare Lanier only with an American writer, but this is not made clear, and, in Lanier's case, is not altogether happy. When Lanier conspicuously built himself up on the example of certain nineteenth century English poets, it surely were more illuminating to rate him, however low, in terms of those who were his literary models and with whom he had spiritual kinship.

This is the fault we find with Professor Mims's work. He is perhaps not conscious himself how he takes the starch out of a reader's attention and fails to interest him in return. He is a careful and conscientious worker, perhaps too conscientious. He is not imaginative, is never magical in fancy, never indulges in humor and sparkle, is never impassioned at right moments — all qualities that Lanier could indulge. He seldom uses an illustration, even one taken from the wide realm of English literature of which Lanier was so fond (not American — how delightfully and unconsciously Southern Lanier was in that!). The biographer's literary style thus droops along with the repression of his natural feelings to which he has allowed himself no vent.

Granting that the verdict as to Lanier's poetry must be a guarded one, the resulting total impression, especially after the positive defense of certain details, should not be one altogether of de-

pression. It is not at all beyond credibility that a perfect stranger to Lanier's writings, perhaps even the majority of casual readers, should look over this biography and have no desire whatever of getting the volumes of Lanier's work and reading further — nay, even possess a definite feeling to the contrary. We ourselves believe that Lanier's life, like Sordello's, was one of struggle through very different phases, rather than one of achievement. But this could have been presented with such sympathy and insight, such humanness, that we should be drawn towards the man and his work and be impelled to look at his writings and read more, as the revelation of his spirit. As it is, the volume before us drives the reader to the wall and he finds himself involuntarily asking: And is this all in respect of the gifted poet-soul of the New South?

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

The University of the South.

## REVIEWS

WASHINGTON IRVING ONCE MORE

In Professor Bowen's appreciative essay on Washington Irving in the April SEWANEE REVIEW there is one point in which, on a question of taste, some of his readers might hesitate to agree with him, and there are two slight inaccuracies which have been suffered to creep in, and which serve to convey somewhat erroneous impressions.

Speaking of the "Sketch Book" Professor Bowen asserts that: "A popular vote would probably put 'The Wife,' 'Rip Van Winkle' and 'The Legend of Sleepy Hollow' easily first, and this verdict would be confirmed by critical judgment. While all are good, these three sketches are felt to be the finest. Their tender pathos, imaginative humor, simplicity and grace have already endeared these three to the hearts of thousands of readers who have lingered, almost spellbound, over their pages; and their charm and beauty will, no doubt, commend them to generations of readers yet unborn. Of this trio 'Rip Van Winkle,' in the popular estimate (perhaps also in the estimate of the critics), is entitled to first place" (p. 175).

In spite of differences of taste, however, it is a question whether, either by popular vote or by critical judgment, so slight and effusively sentimental a sketch as "The Wife" would be ranked along with such classics as "Rip Van Winkle" and "The Legend of Sleepy Hollow." It is even doubtful whether any critics would place this sketch before "The Voyage," with its dreamy reveries so unlike the feverish excitement of a five-day trip on a modern ocean grey-hound, or the Addisonian sketch of "The Country Church," or "Westminster Abbey," with its "notes of the deep-laboring organ" and its solemn meditations among the tombs, reminiscent of Sir Thomas Browne's *Hydriotaphia*. Or what reader would prefer George and Mary in their vine-clad cottage to that leisurely visit to Stratford and the quiet rambles along the banks of the Avon? Where in "The Wife" is there anything comparable to the glimpse of Geoffrey

Crayon in the inn parlor, comfortably seated on his arm-chair throne and wielding his poker-sceptre (both now so carefully preserved and jealously guarded); the delicious humor with which are described the "eloquent dame who shows the Shakespeare house" and her rival, the "gray-headed sexton" and his "superannuated crony," John Ange; the exquisite ease with which Irving's fancy plays about the relics exhibited to him by these "worthy wights," and the good-humored credulity with which he invests all he sees with the "charm of reality;" his reflections on the singular gift of the poet, Shakespeare, "to be able thus to spread the magic of his mind over the very face of nature, to give to things and places a charm and character not their own, and to turn 'this working-day world' into a perfect fairy-land;" and lastly his characteristic moralizing on the emptiness of worldly renown as compared with the "love, admiration and applause, which spring up in his native place," and his rejoicing in the thought that the mighty poet's ashes rest, not in a crowded corner of Westminster Abbey, but in the quiet little village church, "gathered in peace among his kindred and his early friends?"

And now for some matters of fact. On page 179, besides the bad misprint, "A Town in the Prairies" for "A Tour of the Prairies," appears the somewhat confusing statement, "The Recollections [of Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey] were made up of the author's reminiscences of his visits to the historical old abbeys indicated in the title." It is difficult to see how Abbotsford could properly be called "an old abbey," and it is certain that Irving's delightful picture of Scott's family life and his description of the rambles he took up Rhymer's Glen and about the Eildons and other romantic places with the "sterling, golden-hearted old worthy" deserve more than passing mention.

In commenting on the "rollicking humor, the freshness and buoyancy of the narrative, and the whimsical, charming style" of "Knickerbocker's History," Professor Bowen adds: "It is, however, but just to observe that the first few chapters which, by the way, are the product of the collaboration of his brother with Irving, appear somewhat stilted, pompous and pedantic

and make the unhappy impression that the authors were feeling their way and not sure of their footing" (p. 173).

The divergence in style, however, is due to an altogether different reason. Irving and his brother Peter began the book as a "mere *jeu d'esprit*" in burlesque of Dr. Samuel Mitchell's "Picture of New York," then just published, and with this view they took a vast quantity of notes, in emulation of the erudition displayed in the commencement of that work, which began with an account of the Aborigines." On the departure of his brother Peter for Europe, Irving proceeded with the History alone, completely "changed the whole plan of the work, and discarding what had reference to a later period than the Dutch dynasty, and grappling with the other mass of notes, undertook to frame a work according to his new conception. I have heard him say he had hard work to condense into its present shape, the ponderous mass of notes which had been taken for the first book, as a burlesque of erudition and pedantry; that he managed, with infinite labor, to compress it into five introductory chapters, and in subsequent editions would have been glad to compress these into one, but was deterred from undertaking it by the labor it would cost" ("Life and Letters," Chap. xiii). No wonder, then, that the style should appear somewhat pedantic and labored.

JOHN M. MCBRYDE, JR.

Sweet Briar Institute, Virginia.

---

#### HISTORY

##### THE TERRITORIAL ARCHIVES OF MISSISSIPPI

Every new step in the publication of the Archives of the Southern States is a source of gratification not only to the State which authorizes and the individual who executes the work of publishing, but also to the ever increasing number of students of Southern history. Hence we have a warm welcome for the first of the series of Archives of Mississippi, which has recently been printed under the editorship of Mr. Dunbar Rowland, Director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History.



The present work bears the title "Mississippi Territorial Archives, 1798-1803," and is the first volume of a series which is to include the public documents of the Territory and State. Mr. Rowland has in contemplation other series, which, shall comprehend all the charters, organic acts, proclamations and constitutions from the Spanish dominion to the present; reprints of documents in English, French, and Spanish repositories, and of the National archives in Washington that cover the occupation and government of the United States in Mississippi.

This excellent volume of six hundred pages contains the Journals of Executive Proceedings under Governor Winthrop Sargent, from 1798 to April 1801, and under Governor W. C. C. Claiborne from July 10, 1801, to March 27, 1803. These Journals consist largely, though not entirely, of the correspondence of the Governors, which, as one might expect, relates chiefly to official business. Among the more prominent parties to the correspondence were Pickering, Marshall, and Madison, Secretaries of State of the United States; McHenry and Dearborn of the Federal War Department; de Lemos and de Salcedo, Spanish Governors of Louisiana; President Adams and President Jefferson; James Wilkinson and other officers of the Army; besides the Judges and Indian agents of the Territory. We note with a little surprise that there was but one communication between Sargent and John Sevier, the chief executive of the neighboring State of Tennessee. This was written by Sargent in the matter of an extradition case.

A very valuable part of Mr. Rowland's work is found in his biographical sketches of the two governors. Sargent, he tells us, was a Massachusetts man and a Federalist. Most of the people of the Territory were Jeffersonian Republicans, and as a result there were quarrels between the citizens and the government over the laws, which remind us at once of similar disputes in the old colonial period. The election of a territorial legislature did not mend matters, and, when Jefferson succeeded John Adams in the Presidency, Sargent was unable to secure reappointment. Nevertheless, after a trip to the East he returned to the planting life in Mississippi, was interested in financial affairs and died in 1820 in New Orleans. Prior to his experi-

ence in Mississippi, he had served with honor in the Revolution, and as Secretary and acting Governor in the Northwest Territory.

William Charles Cole Claiborne was a son of the noted Virginia family of that name. Seeking his fortune in New York, he gained employment as enrolling clerk to the Federal Congress, and followed that body to Philadelphia. There he attracted the notice of several prominent men, and John Sevier urged him to go to Tennessee. The beginning of his career in the Territory South of the Ohio, was very full of promise, and won favorable comment from William Blount the Governor. Claiborne sat in the Constitutional Convention of 1796, became a judge of the Supreme Court of the State (at twenty-two!) and was twice sent to the House of Representatives. In 1801, when only twenty-six he was appointed by Jefferson to be Governor of Mississippi Territory, and it is this part of his life which is covered by the Journal. Two years later the President sent him to act with Wilkinson as Commissioner to receive the cession of Louisiana from Laussat, and he acted as Provisional Governor until October 2, 1804. At that time he was regularly transferred from Mississippi and made Governor of Orleans Territory, in which capacity he continued to act until his election, in 1812, to be the first Governor of the State of Louisiana. In 1817 he was elected to the Senate of the United States, but in that year his career was cut short by his death "on the threshold," says Mr. Rowland, "of a great national career."

Mr. Rowland has included portraits of both Governor Sargent and Governor Claiborne. These, with a photographic fac-simile of the first page of Sargent's journal, constitute the illustrations. Besides explanatory footnotes, the editor has provided a satisfactory table of the letters and a sufficient index.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT.

---

A HISTORY DE LUXE

In the flood of American histories with which the last two or three years have deluged the public, there have been all sorts of

books. Some, for example, Osgood's "The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century," appeal only to the specialist. Others, like "The American Nation," edited by Professor Hart, or "The History of the United States" by Professor Channing, are expected to stand the criticism of scholars and yet to interest the general public. Still others, such as the series edited by Mr. G. C. Lee are attractive in their outward guise but within prove to be poor or at least of variable worth. We have coöperative histories, histories by simple writers, little books and big books (the latter seem to predominate), works without any illustrations and works that are found to be art galleries in miniature.

To this throng which stands awaiting the verdict of time and trial, the Burrows Brothers Company of Cleveland have contributed "A History of the United States and Its People," by Dr. Elroy McKendree Avery. Only two volumes have thus far appeared, the first limited to the treatment of prehistoric America, the Indians, and the discoveries; the second devoted to the history of the English, French and Dutch colonies from 1600 to 1660. The work was originally planned for completion in twelve volumes, but already it has been found necessary to prepare for the increase of that number to fifteen. However, if not another page were given to the world, these two volumes would win ample admiration and respect for the ideal conceived by Dr. Avery and his publisher-friend, Colonel Burrows.

For in some ways this work is unique. It is intended, not for the special student, but for the American people, and the author is a compiler rather than an investigator of original sources. But Dr. Avery differs from most second-hand writers, first in the breadth and depth of his reading and second in his *desire* for absolute accuracy. If errors do occur in his book it is not for lack of honest effort to prevent them. Hence this work commends itself, — above all the other "popular" histories of the day, — on the ground of accuracy. In this respect, a comparison with many of the volumes of the late Mr. Fiske would redound favorably to Dr. Avery.

To these characteristics of wide and varied reading and of intended accuracy, is added an equally notable and praiseworthy

determination to make the book beautiful. That this effort will be justified, in the near future, by adequate pecuniary returns must seem to the layman hardly credible. For apparently no expense has been spared to make Dr. Avery's history what we have ventured to describe as an art gallery in miniature. The fine paper and the large type make the text pleasant to read, while the illustrations are so rich and so profuse as to call forth the highest admiration. We think that perhaps even of the best there are too many; a few cuts might certainly have been omitted. We question the usefulness of pictures of modern monuments, and of the seal of the Jamestown Exposition Company. These exceptions, however, are few and far between, and for the rest praise is hardly to be exaggerated. To present so many facsimile pages of rare manuscripts and pamphlets, so many reproductions of maps and portraits is a great educational service. There are few men who may in a lifetime expect to see even a part of the historical materials thus excellently gathered together. The Public Record Office., the British Museum, the New York Public Library, the John Carter Brown Library, and many other collections have been drawn upon for these photographs.

For an exhaustive criticism of details this does not seem the place. In general we are confident that this work of Dr. Avery's will be found charming to the eye and full of interest and suggestiveness: and the reader, while thus pleasantly entertained may feel sure that he is reading a good presentation of the facts of American history.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT

---

#### PHILOSOPHY

THE WORLD'S EPOCH-MAKERS. Edited by Oliphant Smeaton. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This very useful series of hand-books is designed to give popular information in regard to the great leaders, whether in religion, philosophy or science, who have had much to do with directing and moulding the world's thought. The following volumes are before us:

PLATO. By David G. Ritchie, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrews.

The life of Plato is briefly sketched, and some account is given of his leading Dialogues and treatises, "the aim being to present Plato's thought in its true historic setting and significance, free from Neo-Platonic incrustations." Professor Ritchie's interpretation of Plato's thought is an independent one, differing in several points from that set forth in many of the current Histories of Philosophy.

ORIGEN, AND GREEK PATRISTIC THEOLOGY. By Rev. William Fairweather, M.A.

This volume is a distinctly timely one, in view of the fact that there is at present a well-defined tendency in religious thought to revert to the original sources of Christian Theology in the writings of the Greek Fathers of the Church. These men were the first to attempt a systematic construction and interpretation of Christian doctrine, and among them Origen stands *facile princeps*, in respect to his vast learning, his untiring industry, and the extent and value of his labors in editing the text of Holy Scripture.

DESCARTES AND SPINOZA. By James Iverach, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Christian Ethics in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

It is fitting that these two names should be coupled together inasmuch as they stand at the head of the modern speculative movement. While Descartes originated a school of thinkers, Spinoza's soul, even as Milton's, was "like a star, and dwelt apart." Yet Spinoza as well as Descartes has exerted a strong formative influence upon subsequent philosophical thought. To Descartes Spinoza was deeply indebted, both in respect to his method, and for suggestions as to the general philosophic problem. It is a fortunate circumstance that the task of interpreting these two thinkers, both as to the respective systems of each, and in their relations to one another, should have been intrusted to the capable hands of one so well known both in this country and in Great Britain, as is Dr. Iverach.



PASCAL AND THE PORT ROYALISTS. By William Clark, D.D., etc., Professor in Trinity College, Toronto.

This is a presentation of one of the most eminent of Frenchmen, and one of the greatest of spiritual seers. Dr. Clark is enthusiastic about his subject, and his work is worthy of the spirit in which it is undertaken. The sage of Port Royal is set before us not only in his scientific work, his Provincial Letters and his Thoughts, but in that which surpassed even his writings in greatness — his saintly life.

ROUSSEAU. By William Henry Hudson, late Professor of English Literature in the University of Chicago.

This volume is divided into two parts, respectively entitled, *The Man, and His Work and Influence*; the first Part including about a third of the book, and the second the remaining two-thirds. It would seem to be easier to treat of the far-reaching influence of Rousseau than of the details of his life and of his rather puzzling character, especially in a popular work intended for the English-speaking public. Not only by his writings, but by his romantic and highly emotional temperament, Rousseau exerted a marked and leading influence in the great reaction from artificiality to naturalism in life and literature which characterized the latter half of the eighteenth century.

HUME. By James Orr, M.A., D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow.

Professor Orr is widely known as a clear and vigorous thinker, both along theological and philosophical lines. The task of interpreting Hume could have been intrusted to no more capable hands than his, and he has fulfilled his task in a manner worthy at once of his subject and of himself.

ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY: A Practical Manual for Colleges and Normal Schools, presenting the Facts and Principles of Mental Analysis. By Lightner Witmer. Boston: Ginn & Co., The Athenaeum Press.

"This Manual comprises a series of experiments that can be performed by untrained students of psychology without supplementary explanation on the part of the teacher, and without

costly and complicated apparatus. . . . The course of the analysis successively presents the essential features of apperception, perception, attention, the range and limits of consciousness, the association of mental contents and of physiological and physical processes, the relation of mental contents to these processes, and the sensation as the mental element." These words of the author perhaps best define the scope and method of the book. Professor Witmer acknowledges special obligations to his first preceptors, Professor Fullerton and Professor Cattell, and especially to Wundt, the founder of the modern school of experimental psychology. A great part of the value of this volume consists in the rich and handsomely-executed series of (thirty-nine) Charts, which are to be used in the conduct of the experiments. Dr. Witmer's aim is to develop in those who are preparing to become teachers of psychology freedom from an undue subservience to authority, and a just and wholesome reliance upon their own powers of observation and reflection. In this purpose he will have the sympathy of all right-minded friends of education.

**PSYCHOLOGY: An Introductory Study of the Structure and Function of Human Consciousness.** By James Rowland Angell, Head of the Department of Psychology in the University of Chicago. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1904.

This excellent manual is a clear and attractive interpretation of the phenomena of consciousness and of mental action in the light of the most recent results of physiological psychology. We know of no better text-book to put into the hands of college and normal school students than this. Its merit is attested by the fact that it has already been adopted in a large number of our leading colleges and universities.

**A HISTORY OF THE PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY.** By Paul Janet and Gabriel Séailles. Translated by Ada Monahan. Edited by Henry Jones, LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company.

This useful and attractive work comprises four parts, dealing successively with Psychology, Ethics, Metaphysics and Theodicy. The topical method is followed throughout; e.g., Reason

is examined in the light of its historical treatment "from the vague declamations of the earlier philosophers against sensuous knowledge to the Cartesian theories, the criticism of Kant, and the empiricism of Mill and Herbert Spencer," (Vol. I, p. 143). Similarly, the problem of Matter is discussed in the light of its historical development (Part III, Chap. II), beginning with the hylozoism of the first philosophers, and the atomism of Democritus, and coming on down through the systems of successive Greek thinkers to the doctrines of modern philosophers, from Gassendi to Feuerbach, Moleschott and Büchner. The work is marked by orderly arrangement, clearness of exposition and lucidity of style, to which last quality justice is done, moreover, by the excellent work of the translator. It is a valuable repertory of information on all the leading topics of philosophical thought.

WILLIAM S. BISHOP.

---

#### THEOLOGY

**THE HOLY COMMUNION.** By the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford. Longmans.

This volume is one of that series of scholarly and useful manuals known as the Oxford Library of Practical Theology, notes upon several volumes of which have already appeared in the columns of *THE SEWANEE REVIEW*. Mr. Stone's treatment of the subject of Eucharistic doctrine and practice is mainly historical, beginning with the New Testament, and coming down through the Patristic, Mediæval and Reformation periods to the present day. The Holy Communion is considered under two distinct aspects:—(1) as the Sacrament of spiritual nourishment, (The Lord's Supper), and (2) as a Sacrifice. The standpoint from which the book is written, and the general treatment of the subject remind one of Bishop Gore's work, "The Body of Christ." While, as might have been expected, there is little that is new in these pages, yet we are under obligation to Mr. Stone for having brought together a large amount of valuable material, for having arranged it in connected and orderly fashion, and for having set it forth in clear and attractive style. We are thus presented,

in comparatively brief compass, with a comprehensive view of a subject which is of great interest and importance, especially in view of the noteworthy development of liturgical studies within recent years. On page 171 there is a statement whose accuracy we question. Mr. Stone says of the Declaration on Kneeling at the Communion (the so-called "Black Rubric" of the English Book of Common Prayer), "As the 'Declaration' had stood in 1552, a possible, but very unlikely interpretation might have made it consistent with belief in the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine." The words of the "Declaration" as they stand in the Prayer Book of 1552 are as follows:—"lest . . . the said kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. . . . And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here." We submit the question whether it is possible to reconcile the above language with belief in the "Real Presence;" a doctrine which it appears designed to set aside plainly and *in terminis*. We do not mean by this to assert that the same must be said of the "Black Rubric" as it now stands in the *present* Prayer Book of the Church of England. As for the American Book of Common Prayer, the Declaration is there omitted altogether.

REMINDERS OF OLD TRUTHS. By Hannah E. Pipe. Longmans.

This really admirable little book is addressed by the authoress "to the friends whom I affectionately remember as girls, sending to them these reminders of old truths by way of God-speed and farewell." The work is divided into two parts, Part I treating of certain directly religious topics as such, and Part II discussing truths connected with domestic and other relationships. Among the topics treated in Part I, are "The Decalogue," "Christian Perfection," "Sacrifice," "Prayer," "The Will of God," "The Fight of Faith." Part II includes chapters on "Family Life," "Domestic Service," "Hospitality," "Unhappy

Marriages," "Order," "Method," "Manners;" all of which subjects are discussed not only in a spirit of genuine piety, but also with a practical wisdom which can only be the ripe fruit of a long life of Christian experience. There are many sentences or even paragraphs which we should like to quote, did space permit. A few must suffice, which may serve to illustrate the character of the book as a whole. Speaking of reverence, (p. 9)—"Even on fit occasions (God's Name) is not to be too familiarly uttered. Familiarity is dangerous in our intercourse with one another; in the most intimate relationships of home some ceremony is 'as rosemary to love.'" Under the head of the Fifth Commandment:—"There is in all obedience an element of self-control." "In these democratic days the praises of authority and obedience are little sung" (p. 15). Under the Sixth Commandment,— "Of righteous anger there is far too little in the world." "Mild He (Christ) was not in denunciation of men like foxes, vipers, dogs and swine. Careless and cold-hearted persons are incapable of wrath like His" (p. 17). "Ill-temper is diabolical." "Murder is commoner than we know" (p. 19). Speaking of divorce (under the head of the Seventh Commandment), "No Heaven awaits the repentance which is unto remission of duties. Such absolution is dissolution. It makes for universal corruption, ending in 'Chaos and Old Night'" (p. 22). As to the ethics of love and marriage:—"From the pulpit and at school young people receive but slight warning of the perplexities amid which, as in a maze, they may lose their way. The difficult duty is for the most part relegated to novelists and poets" (p. 23).

Under the head of Order (p. 174):—"The most encouraging story of reformation that I ever heard was told me recently. Sir T. Fowell Buxton was most disorderly, especially over his papers. In the seclusion of a grave illness, having time to ponder his ways, he repented of this bad habit, and on recovering he sorted his papers, provided them with pigeon-holes, and thenceforth lived a new life from the orderly point of view, and could lay his hand at once on any document wanted." Manners (pp. 187, 188):—"Good Manners save trouble. . . . Is it going too far to say, Never be in a hurry? Certainly it is a counsel of perfection, but perhaps not of despair. He who set us the great



example went through His earthly life with majestic tranquility, and yet left nothing unfinished that He intended to do. . . . Can we not in the track of His footsteps let fretting go, and achieve some statelier peace?"

**PRAEPARATIO OR NOTES OF PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION:**  
Founded on the Collect, Epistle and Gospel for every Holy Day and Saint's Day in the Year. With Preface by the Rev. George Congreve, M.A. Longmans.

This manual of devotion contains a large store of material suitable for spiritual meditation. Like the best devotional works of the Oxford High-church school, of which it is a product, this volume is marked at once by spirituality and self-restraint. While the inner sense of Holy Scripture is penetrated and is interpreted along lines which may be called "Catholic," the personal element is not obtruded. As Fr. Congreve says in his Preface to the work,— "It is cheering for us, in times of keen historical controversy and questioning of the sacred texts, to contemplate in our prayer that which is not subject to question, — the stream of transcendent character, the light of heroic virtue, which runs all through the Christian age — the lives of the Saints."

**THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PRAYER.** The Bohlen Lectures for 1904.  
By the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. Longmans.

Bishop Hall has here presented in four lectures the teaching of the New Testament as to Prayer: — its character, method and aim; the spirit which should inform it, and the results which may be rightly expected to follow upon its faithful exercise. In this connection a number of important topics are discussed with spiritual insight united with breadth and accuracy of learning. "The subjective value of Prayer depends on its being really heard." "Intercession includes the faithful departed." "Danger of the Practice of Invocation of Saints:" — these are among the positions which are clearly stated and ably defended from Scripture, reason and Christian experience. As to various questions which have been raised and difficulties which have been urged in connection with Prayer, Bishop Hall says: — "It is the

wretchedly low standard of life and desire on the part of those who profess and call themselves Christians which gives occasion for so many of our theoretical difficulties." In the prevalence of "Christian Science" is seen a result of our failure to realize New Testament standards.

**THE CREED OF CHRIST.** By the Rev. R. V. Lancaster Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

This is a devout and sincere attempt, conceived in a direct and straightforward way and clothed in simple, unaffected and attractive style, to set forth what was the personal belief of Christ Himself, so far as this can be collected from the Gospels. While holding firmly to the Divinity of Christ, and the inspiration and final authority of the Scriptures, Mr. Lancaster aims to set forth along Scriptural lines and with abundant Scripture references the personal belief of the Man Christ Jesus on such fundamental topics as The Scriptures, God, Satan, Christ Himself, The Kingdom of God in the World, the Holy Spirit, the Second Coming. This little book will doubtless prove spiritually helpful and comforting to many.

**IDEALS OF SCIENCE AND FAITH.** Essays by Various Authors. Edited by the Rev. J. E. Hand. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The aim of the editor in compiling this volume of Essays by writers representing various types of scientific and religious thought is to illustrate and help forward that mutual understanding and coöperation between men of science and teachers of religion which is admitted on all hands to be so desirable, and yet is so far from being fully realized. Sir Oliver Lodge, Principal of the University of Birmingham, is the representative of Physics; while Biology, Psychology, Sociology, Ethics and Education are each represented by a well-known writer. From the point of view of Religion, essays are presented by representatives of the Presbyterian, Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, while the Rev. P. N. Waggett, the author of "Science and Religion," contributes a paper entitled "The Church as Seen from Outside." The purpose of the book is commendable, and the volume should prove helpful as throwing light upon the vexed

questions as to the relation of the results to religious belief of recent scientific investigation and of present-day culture and education.

THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rt. Rev. Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., Bishop of Stepney. Longmans. 1905.

The chapters of which this book is composed were originally in the form of lectures on Pastoral Theology, delivered in the Divinity School at Cambridge, England, in the year 1904. They deal with such practical problems as The Spread of Science, Criticism of the Bible, The Spirit of Independence, The Religious Indifference of the Masses, The Opportunity of Teaching and Reaching the Masses. Bishop Lang is regarded by many as one of the strongest, if not the strongest preacher of the Anglican Church in London to-day. Directness and intense earnestness characterize these addresses, which are the utterance of a strenuous worker and a magnetic personality, grappling with some of the most urgent problems which force themselves upon the Church at the present moment.

STUDIES IN THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By Rev. the Hon. E. Littleton, M.A. Longmans.

This is a series of some thirty careful and painstaking studies upon the most striking utterances of our Lord in the great discourse recorded in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. The main purpose of the volume being expository and practical, "scarcely anything is said about such controversial subjects as the relation between Matthaean and Lukan reports, or on critical and textual questions, except where they seem to be bound up with the interpretation of the words." A careful and scholarly treatment of the principles and doctrines enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount.

THE COMMON HOPE: First-fruits of Ministerial Experience in Thought and Life. Edited by the Rev. Rosslyn Bruce, M.A. Longmans.

A series of papers written by several of the younger clergy of the English Church upon various phases of Church thought and work. This book, with the lectures of the Bishop of Stepney,

which we have already noticed, and the Rev. Clement Rogers's "Principles of Parish Work," (see below) are among the many evidences of the active thought and vigorous effort in dealing with practical problems which characterize the English Church to-day. Bishop Lang contributes an Introduction setting forth the aim of the book and the spirit in which the papers were written. To quote his statement, the motive of the writers "was to give some expression, based on actual experience, to the conviction that the ministry of the Church of England offers . . . a career full not only of responsibility and trial, but also, and chiefly, of privilege and happiness. The writers are men young enough in the service of the Church to feel that the future with its possibilities is still before them, and old enough to claim that their faith and enthusiasm have stood the test of some years of practical experience." Among the subjects treated are "The Church and Her Testimony," "Convictions," "The Church and Temperance," "Clerical Mannerisms," "Church Army Methods," "The Joy of Ministry."

Somewhat similar in its scope to the above, though dealing more with the details of parochial administration, is *PRINCIPLES OF PARISH WORK*, by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. As indicated by the sub-title, the work is an "Essay in Pastoral Theology." While especially adapted to English conditions, this book should afford many helpful suggestions to American clergymen, and those who have to do with matters of church administration.

*THE PARABLES OF THE WAY.* By A. Allen Brockington, M.A. Longmans.

This little volume is an attempt more or less successful to correlate the teachings of the Beatitudes with the twelve "parables of the way;" i.e., the parables recorded by St. Luke as having been spoken by our Lord on His last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (St. Luke ix, 51 — xix, 11). A suggestive and helpful devotional study, in which points of teaching are illustrated and applied by references to instances in life and literature, both ancient and modern.

REUNION ESSAYS: With an Appendix on the Non-Infallible Dogmatic Force of the Bull, "Apostolicæ Curæ," of Pope Leo XIII in Condemnation of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. R. Carson (Roman Catholic priest). Longmans.

This is a statement of the "irreducible minimum" of Roman claims in regard to certain matters at issue between the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches. The writer is in theological sympathy with the late Cardinal Newman, and is willing to go quite half-way to meet such Anglo-Catholic leaders as Lord Halifax, with a view to the reunion of the two Churches. An apparently exceedingly moderate and limited view of Papal infallibility is presented. "The conditions necessary, according to the (Vatican) Decree, for the due exercise of Papal Infallibility are so searching that theologians can only unanimously state that they have been fulfilled in a solitary instance, — that of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* of Pius IX, defining the Immaculate Conception, — from the days of Peter to those of his latest successor" (p. 251). With regard to the Bull of Pope Leo XIII, condemning Anglican orders, Father Carson holds that, should certain prior conditions be fulfilled, and "should fresh evidence come to light . . . there is nothing to prevent a future Pope . . . from disregarding the decision of 1896" (p. 257).

WILLIAM S. BISHOP.

---

#### EDUCATION

THE PHILIPPINE EXPERIENCES OF AN AMERICAN TEACHER: A Narrative of Work and Travel in the Philippine Islands. By William B. Freer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906.

This volume essays nothing more pretentious than its title claims: it is a narrative of Philippine experiences on the part of an American teacher during a residence of three years. The style is simple and clear, the writer's attitude one of optimism, and his spirit sympathetic with the Islanders and appreciative of nature and the minor points of daily life. Neither too far given to analysis nor dogmatism, the treatment is pleasant and gives information both valuable and interesting on a variety of subjects — the people, their daily life, tastes, and attitude, the



American school methods, the physical aspects of the Islands, points to travellers, the descriptions of the use and need of the national animal, the *carabao*. A glossary is given at the end of the book, also a note of reference to "descriptive works on the Philippines most likely to interest the general reader," and an index.

**NATURE AND HEALTH: A Popular Treatise on the Hygiene of the Person and the Home.** By Edward Curtis, A.M., M.D. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1906.

A popular treatise on "Nature and Health" for lay use has become a virtual necessity to the home maker and this contribution to that need is made by one of wide experience. The work is carefully and wisely done and if the language, particularly in the chapter on "Eating," is technical and difficult for the average reader, it perhaps could not be avoided. The model Health Book needs however to be less of the form of discussion or essay and more specific and definite in its nature. A careful review of the compact arrangement of the best Cook Books and even the old-fashioned Home Physicians should result helpfully to one having in mind the structure of the practical book of "Nature and Health" for family use.

**PROBLEMS OF BABYHOOD: Building a Constitution; Forming a Character.** By Rachel Kent Fitz, A.M., and George Wells Fitz, M.D. Illustrations by E. A. Bell. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1906.

Prettily bound and illustrated, "Problems of Babyhood" calls us from the experimental side of child life to the practical details of his physical well-being and the mental and moral uplift resulting therefrom. It again is written from the standpoint of the parent and personal experience, but this time a physician has the case in hand and his close observation of his own child is made wiser by the general experience and wider outlook of the practitioner. In "Building a Constitution," Fresh Air, Clothing, Sleep, and Exercise are the subjects intelligently treated. In "Forming a Character" a more difficult matter is sympathetically and helpfully discussed under the heads: Foundations, the Mother, the Child. The book ought to prove a helpful addition to the Mother's collection.

## LITERARY CRITICISM

LITERATURE: ITS PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS. By Theodore W. Hunt, Professor of English in Princeton University. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1906.

Professor Hunt's book is far-reaching in subject-matter. In its general purview, it wishes to give a definition of literature, lay down the guiding principles in its interpretation, explain its scope and spirit, show the methods and mission of literary study, and point out the relations between literature on the one side and on the other science, philosophy, politics, ethics, the arts, etc., etc. Then follows a discussion of the general literary species, both poetic types and prose forms. Some phases resulting from a practical application of the method is seen in the hints on some of the open questions in literature, the theory of the Hebraic and Hellenic spirit, and the place of literature in education.

This scheme is doubtless somewhat old-fashioned, and looks not a little like the older philosophies of literature. There are, however, unquestionably, many useful hints and happy suggestions. The chief fault of the presentation, almost inherent in a work of this sort, is that it reads too far like class-notes, a syllabus of the thing it treats rather than a full, free exposition. The exposition that does most service is the one that will take a few fixed principles and work these out clearly and thoughtfully, being cast in as perfect literary form as may be.

The material in this one book, fully developed, would fill a whole set of volumes. None the less it is certain that the main thesis here presented is correct: Literature as a serious study of college and university, nay, of fullest maturity, is becoming more and more one of the most vital concerns of all education and of life.

THE STUDY OF THE NOVEL. By Selden L. Whitcomb, Associate Professor in the University of Kansas. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1905.

A COURSE IN NARRATIVE. By Gertrude Buck, Associate Professor in Vassar College, and Elizabeth Woodbridge Morris. New York: Henry Holt & Company. 1906.

The subject of fiction will not have done, and the college professor has taken to dealing with it seriously. The novel has

never been reduced to laws, and after studying the history of its development, the student of forms of writing is trying to analyze the varying and notable examples and see just what is their structure and method.

In this country Professor Brander Matthews of Columbia published his "Aspects of Fiction" ten years ago, and Professor Whitcomb, a former pupil, dedicates his present work "To Brander Matthews, as Critic and Teacher." Professor Cross of Yale wrote his "Development of the English Novel" in 1899; a year later Professor Stoddard of New York offered his book on "The Evolution of the Novel." Meanwhile specimens of narration and of the short story were appearing for college classes. At length, in "A Study of Prose Fiction" in 1902, Professor Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, discussed for the first time, from both a professional and an editorial point of view, the study of fiction as an art.

Both of the books before us present this later view of the subject in their analyses, in the principles laid down, and in the numerous illustrations offered; and both will prove suggestive, and helpful. Professor Whitcomb's book covers a wide field, is rich in data, frequently passes into foreign contemporary literature for its illustrations, and has at the end a valuable bibliography of the History of Novelistic Criticism and references used. Its defects are those of presentation, being too far a mere digest of notes and syllabus on the subject. In this respect the "Course in Narrative" is more sprightly and attractive in style, as we might expect from two ladies, and possesses the greater literary merit. Indeed, for a book nearly one half the size, it displays a stimulating form as well as contains a large amount of illustrative material.

---

#### FICTION

IN THE NAME OF LIBERTY. By Owen Johnson. New York: The Century Co.

This is a bright, alert historical novel of the days of the French Revolution. It does not drag on to the scene the great actors in that stupendous drama, a thing which few novelists do

successfully. It uses the Revolution as a background, and follows the fortunes of its heroine and her lover through the stress and the terror of the times. But it presents a lively picture of the fearful scenes and of the dangers which in those days encompassed one on every hand, and it sustains our interest to the end. The descriptions are vivid, the dialogue brisk, and the characters real, clearly drawn and vital. It is an entertaining and profitable book.

G. B. R.

FROZEN DOG TALES AND OTHER THINGS. By Col. Wm. C. Hunter. Boston: The Everett Press. 1905.

Frozen Dog is a town in Idaho and it is from wit and wisdom collected there that the present volume is compounded. We are told that all sorts of wild creatures of the field and air abound in this section and funny little pictures of these are used to separate the different contributions. There is a more elaborate landscape scene at the top of the page, the illustrating being done by L. Holme and R. M. Hynes. The contents are varied: poems, tales, aphorisms, examined with that raw humor and shrewd common-sense which we have become accustomed to ascribe to the Border country people, those Bret Harte discovered and presented to us with such inimitable charm. This form of humor is called properly horse-humor and the laugh it engenders is a horse-laugh, not elegant for human beings it may be, but vigorous and helpful occasionally.

MY LITTLE BOY. By Carl Ewald. Illustrated from the Danish by Alexander Teixeira DeMattos. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. \$1.00 net.

As the translator tells us Carl Ewald was born fifty years ago and has served at times in his life as forester and as school-master which gave him his love of nature and his love of children. His writings are both psychological and mystical and he ascribes a radicalism in his nature "for which there is little room in Denmark" to the extreme piety and conservatism of his rearing. In Georg Brandes he acknowledges a literary master and inspiration.

"My Little Boy" adds another volume to the rapidly growing

library on childhood and the problems it presents or, perhaps unfortunately, is coming to be thought to present. The content is a series of sketches on the life of a usual little boy from about two to seven years of age and the temptations and struggles and falls of the human soul in its beginnings are familiar to all parents. Equally familiar and interesting are the very natural portrayals of the parents' attitude when these delicate points arise, and it is in this that quite subtly a good deal of philosophy and suggestion and child-psychology are worked in to add to the vast and infinite store of knowledge requisite for latter day parenthood. The publishers must be thanked for offering this little book in very attractive form and binding.

THE YOUNG O'BRIENS: Being an Account of their Sojourn in London. By the author of "Elizabeth's Children." New York: The Bodley Head, John Lane Company. 1906. \$1.50.

A not altogether unsympathetic observer once designated a family of children as "a lot of terrible young ruffians" and one is reminded of this in making the acquaintance of "The Young O'Briens." This interesting aggregation is forced by money troubles and the ill-health of the mother from a charming, free out-door life in Ireland to the confinement and restrictions of a well-conducted old maid aunt's home in London. The young people are depressed but in no sense controlled by their new circumstances and their entire freedom from any feeling of responsibility or delicate consideration of their aunt and her property produces confusion in London. The humor of the book and personal attractions of the characters united with their Irish luck produces a series of interesting episodes and diffuse a spirit of *bonhomie* which wins the aunt and breaks through the mist of initial reserve in the reader.

---

#### POETRY

SELECTIONS FROM THE POETRY OF JOHN PAYNE. Made by Tracy and Lucy Robinson. With an Introduction by Lucy Robinson. New York: The Bodley Head, The John Lane Co. 1906.

John Payne is best known for his expressive rendering of the "Arabian Nights,"—which Burton, it is said, notoriously pil-



ferred in his version—and as translator of other works from the Arabic and Persian as well as of Villon and Boccaccio. His work in original verse was first popularly made known by Gleeson White's delightful collection of Ballades, Rondeaux, etc., in the Canterbury Poets series, where several selections from John Payne were given. In the same series Samuel Waddington's collection of "Sonnets of This Century" introduced John Payne as sonneteer. As might be expected, Mr. Payne shows in his poems the result of his world-wide acquaintance with other languages and literary forms. His most frequent forms are thus, after the opening "Dedication to Richard Wagner," the tale in verse, i. e., the Ballad and the Romance; the numerous French forms—the madrigal, rondel, rondeau, chant royal, barcarole, pantoum—a language and literature that was very close to him; and twenty sonnets at the close, including one in Italian (after Milton's example) and two in French.

While all these are suited to his genius, to a lover of the legends and tales of long ago and elsewhere, the ballad form is peculiarly his. His admirers compare "The Ballad of Isobel" with Rossetti's "Blessed Damozel" and wish to contend that were it so well known it would be as much admired. But this is going too far. Both are based upon the supernatural; and while we may find John Payne's poem tender and graceful, it has not the magical halo of other-worldliness that is shed about Rossetti's masterpiece.

A SHROPSHIRE LAD. By A. E. Housman. New York: The Bodley Head, The John Lane Co. 1906.

It is a dainty note the Shropshire Lad sings, though it proceeds from an instrument of not very wide register. The poems—fifty-three in number—are all lyrical and of the country-side, descriptive of the woods and phases of the country and of the thoughts of country-folk. From this it is an easy passage to the country tale of mingled superstition and realism, the curious blending of supernatural belief and gross actuality, with a tinge of humor and of fatalism. The Shropshire Lad, a child of the country, has been able still to keep this folk-feeling. The origin of his muse is the folk-song, and its expression never de-

parts far from the simpler forms of verse, usually in quatrains, something akin to those of the ballad, or of the nature of the pastoral. It is just this presentation of a naïve touch that make him for many a delight.

We quote the simple joy of these lines under the trees and blossoms :

Loveliest of trees, the cherry now  
Is hung with bloom along the bough,  
And stands about the woodland ride  
Wearing white for Eastertide.

Now, of my threescore years and ten,  
Twenty will not come again,  
And take from seventy springs a score,  
It only leaves me fifty more.

And since to look at things in bloom  
Fifty springs are little room,  
About the woodlands I will go  
To see the cherry hung with snow.

## NOTES

The death of a number of important persons must be recorded. That of Dr. Richard Garnett of the British Museum, London, will be a personal loss to many who recall kindnesses on his part. This kindliness and interest were extended also to the realm of letters in a distinguished career. More than one of his works, his "History of Italian Literature," his "William Shakespeare, Pedagogue and Poacher," etc., were noticed at the time of their appearance in THE SEWANEE REVIEW. The early portions of the Illustrated Record of "English Literature" were his, Mr. Gosse being responsible for the latter parts. One of his latest books that was attracting curious attention, published anonymously, as he was frequently moved to do, was the "*De Flagello Myrteo: CCCLX Thoughts and Fancies on Love*," the authorship of which became avowed at his death. Passing his life among books he had abundant opportunity, in addition to his serious work, to follow his fancies among numerous odd by-paths.

---

The death of Carl Schurz, the most noted of German-Americans, removes the most prominent citizen of foreign birth in the later days of our Republic. Coming into note in his support of Mr. Lincoln, his national importance, apart from party service, may be said to have become first generally recognized in his wise, courageous and business-like administration of Indian affairs while Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes. His part in the Presidential campaign of 1884 is memorable, and on many notable public occasions his voice was still to be heard. While achieving distinction in many ways, it was as an orator that he was pre-eminent, when he would throw his whole energy into the support of what he believed to be a great and moral idea. The strong Teutonic side of his nature found full expression then, his command over the intimate processes of English thought, though acquired, being something wonderful.

In literature he is best known as the author of the "Life of Henry Clay" in the American Statesmen series, a valuable study of American political conditions through half a century by a foreign trained mind.

---

Scandinavia had hardly done mourning for Alexander Kielland, novelist, when she was called upon to feel the deeper loss of Henrik Ibsen, the greatest figure in Scandinavian literature—some think in all literatures—of recent times. Ibsen was not so much reformer as artist, as a writer in the editorial columns of the *Evening Post* happily emphasized. While putting his finger straightway on the sore of the body social and politic, Ibsen doesn't indicate the cure. It is primarily the artistic, not the didactic effect, he is seeking to produce. Hence, perhaps, one of the most frequent sources of futile discussion anent his work. The power of this art, producing its effects with economy of words and action, yet revealing intimately both character and emotion, was both novel and little short of marvelous. He took the dramatic form, perhaps the most difficult and the highest of all literary forms, and succeeded in altering its technique and methods as perhaps no one since Shakespeare. At first slow to be recognized (the writer remembers from his student days in Berlin how slow even the public of the German capital was in receiving Ibsen's plays, before what may be called his success in 1889, wrought largely by a band of devoted followers), his art is now universally admitted even by those in whom his subject-matter and treatment still arouse dissent.

The readers of THE SEWANEE REVIEW need not be reminded of the admirable "Study of Ibsen's Dramatic Method" by the late Professor Thomas R. Price in an early number of the REVIEW (May, 1894) and the more recent articles on "Ibsen as a Dramatist" (July, 1905) and on "Ibsen's Youth" (October, 1905).